

VOL. XLII.

JULY 23 1920

UNIV. OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

WHOLE No. 162

THE

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Founded by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

EDITED BY

CHARLES WILLIAM EMIL MILLER

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

WITH THE COOPERATION OF

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD, HERMANN COLLITZ, TENNEY FRANK,
WILFRED P. MUSTARD, D. M. ROBINSON

APRIL, MAY, JUNE

1920

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

Entered as second-class matter October 16, 1911, at the post office at Baltimore, Maryland, under
the Act of March 3, 1879.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October
3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I.—Unlisted Fragments of Aeschylus. By HERBERT WEIR SMYTH,	101
II.—Epicurean Determinism in the Aeneid. By TENNEY FRANK,	115
III.—Notes on the Text of Asklepiodotos. By W. A. OLDFATHER,	127
IV.—The Latin Text of the Paris Psalter: A Collation and Some Conclusions. By ROBERT L. RAMSAY,	147
V.—The Beginning of the Fourth Gospel. By PAUL HAUPT,	177
VI.—Vocalic Harmony in Fox. By TRUMAN MICHELSON,	181
REVIEWS:	184
Villeneuve's <i>Essai sur Périclès</i> .—Price's <i>Suetonii De vita Caesarum liber VIII.</i> —Corpus scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum, more particularly Pascal's <i>Catullius</i> , Annibaldi's <i>Tacitus</i> and Sabbadini's <i>Catalepton Maeccenas Prispeum "Quid hoc novi est."</i> —Bloomfield's Life and Stories of the Jaina Savior Pārvyanātha.—Jones's <i>Ojibwa Texta</i> edited by Michelson.	
REPORTS:	192
Rivista di Filologia.—Revue de Philologie.	
BRIEF MENTION,	199
BOOKS RECEIVED,	203

The American Journal of Philology is open to original communications in all departments of philology—classical, comparative, oriental, modern; condensed reports of current philological work; summaries of chief articles in the leading philological journals of Europe; reviews by specialists; bibliographical lists. It is published quarterly. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price, \$6.00 a year, payable in advance (foreign postage, 50 cents, extra); single numbers, \$1.50 each.

Articles intended for publication in the Journal, books for review, and other editorial communications should be addressed to the Editor, Professor C. W. E. Miller, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.

Subscriptions, remittances and business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore, Md.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XLI, 2.

WHOLE No. 162

I.—UNLISTED FRAGMENTS OF AESCHYLUS.

I have here collected, and illustrated by occasional comments, the fragments of Aeschylus that have come to light since the publication of the second edition of Nauck's *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta* in 1889. Here and there, too, additional evidence is now accessible regarding the text of certain fragments already known, while certain others, heretofore grouped among the homeless, are to be freed from further conjecture as to their allocation by the fact that their provenance is now definitely established. In the case of plays whose titles are known, the new items belonging thereto are listed by appropriate numbers under the play in question; otherwise, they are arranged in order under the existing "Αδηλα or placed after the last number of Nauck's "Incertarum fabularum fragmenta."

The increment to our scant stock of the fragments of Aeschylus is due, for the most part, to Reitzenstein, the master of Greek lexicography, whose minute and laborious investigations now enable scholars to gain an approximately adequate conception of the process of transmission, through the most tortuous channels, of the confused mass of etymological, lexicographical and exegetical statements that have successively passed through various compilations until they reached their final resting-place in the latest Byzantine grammatical encyclopaedias.

Of Aeschylean glosses in Photius' *Lexicon*, as known by the manuscript written at the end of the twelfth century and once owned by Thomas Gale, eighty-five were recorded by Naber in his edition of 1864. Of the beginning of the *Lexicon*, the Galeanus (*g*) preserves only two leaves, containing the Intro-

duction, A to Aa', and the glosses Ἀγχίνοια to Ἀδιάκριτος. Two further manuscripts have now enlarged our knowledge of this portion:

1. Four leaves of the Codex Atheniensis 1083 (called by Reitzenstein *a*), written in the sixteenth century, and containing the glosses Ἀβραμαῖος to Ἀγάσσει and Ἀγκιστρένει to Ἀδράστειa. (Edited by Fredrich and Wentzel in the *Nachrichten d. Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, Göttingen, 1896, pp. 309 f.)
2. Codex Berol. graec. oct. 22, written at the end of the eleventh or beginning of the twelfth century, and containing (68^r-111^v) the Introduction and the glosses complete from A to Ἀπαρνός. (Edited by Reitzenstein [and called by him *b*] in *Der Anfang des Lexikons des Photios*, 1897.)

In his "Inedita poetarum Graecorum fragmenta," which appeared in the *Index lectionum* of the University of Rostock for 1890-1, 1891-2, Reitzenstein excerpted certain readings from the mutilated Codex Vat. graec. 1818, discovered and called A by him. This manuscript, together with the inferior Codex Laur. S. Marci 304 (named B), found by E. Miller in 1864, and from which he published extracts in his *Mélanges de litt. grecque* 1868, constitutes the source of the unpublished *Etymologicum genuinum*, the oldest of the later encyclopaedic compilations recording an awakened interest in classical literature. This work was completed between 800 and 850. Both A and B date from about the end of the tenth or the beginning of the eleventh century.

In the absence of any statement to the contrary, all emendations in the passages cited by Photius and the *Etymologicum genuinum* are due to Reitzenstein.

The fragments here assembled from named plays come from the following: Βασσάραι, Κάβειροι (or, probably more correctly, Κάβιροι), Μυσοί, Νεανίσκοι, Ὁπλῶν κρίσις, Προμηθεύς (No. 451 I; which non-extant play of that name, is uncertain), Φινεύς, Ψυχοστασία. One fragment (54 A) surely comes from the (unnamed) Ελευσίνιοι.

ΒΑΣΣΑΡΑΙ 25 A

Παγγαίου γὰρ ἀργυρήλατον
πρῶν' ἀστραπῆς <πίμπλησι> πευκᾶν σέλας

Sehol. (Cod. Vat. graec. 909) on Eur. *Rhes.* 922: Αἰσχύλος δὲ
ἐν Βασσάραις ἀργύρου φησὶν ἐκεῖ μέταλλα. ὅμοίως καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Εὐριπί-

δῆς μικρὸν ὑποβὰς λέγει (v. 970) ‘κρυπτὸς δ’ ἐν ἄντροις τῆς (Musgrave, τῆσδ’ MSS., τοῦσδ’ Schol.) ὑπαργύρου χθονός.’ ὁ δὲ Αἰσχύλος σὺντως· ‘Παγγαίον γὰρ ἀργυρήλατον πρῶνες τὸ τῆς ἀστραπῆς πευκᾶν σέλας.’

The scholion occurs on a loose leaf of the MS. (thirteenth century), which was recognized as fol. 315 by Rabe in *Rhein. Mus.* 63 (1908) 419-422. V. 2 restored by Mekler in *Berl. Phil. Wochenschr.* 28 (1908) 1390. Apart from the metrical difficulty in the line, the juxtaposition of the articles in different case-forms might be defended by *Prom.* 942 τὸν τοῦ τυράννου τοῦ νέου διάκονον, the only instance in Aeschylus.

The first play of the Lycurgeian tetralogy ('Ηδωνοί, Βασσάραι or Βασσαρίδες, Νεανίσκοι, Δυκοῦργος) dealt with the vengeance inflicted by Dionysus on Lycurgus, King of the Edoni, for opposition to the introduction of the worship of the god. The second drama treated of the punishment meted out to Orpheus for a like offence. According to the account of Eratosthenes (Pseudo-Eratosthenes according to Maass), *Cataster.* 24, p. 140, Orpheus worshipped Helios, whom he also called Apollo, and it was his custom to climb Mt. Pangaeus while it was still night in order that he might behold the rising of the sun. The new fragment pictures Orpheus' ascent by torch-light, and is probably taken from a messenger's report to Dionysus. At the instigation of the angry god the recusant was torn to pieces by the Thracian maenads who bore the name Bassarae. If Orpheus in the play addressed Helios as Apollo, the *Βασσάραι* is the first witness to the Orphic syncretism of Apollo and Helios that was to be emphasized by religious speculation in the course of the fifth century (cp. Eur. *Phaethon*, Frag. 781, 11). According to Kern in *Hermes* 24 (1889) 501, the identification is unknown to the earliest Orphicism. Elsewhere Aeschylus both keeps the two deities distinct and brings them into close conjunction. It was probably in the *Βασσάραι* that the Orphic dogma of the identity of Apollo and Dionysus was proclaimed, concerning which mystic equalization Macrobius *Sat.* 1, 18, 6 says: “Euripides in Lycymnio Apollinem Liberumque unum eundemque deum esse significans scribit ‘δέσποτα φιλόδαφνε Βάκχε,
παιὰν Ἀπολλον εὐλυρε’ (Frag. 477). Ad eandem sententiam Aeschylus ‘ὁ κισσεὺς Ἀπόλλων, ὁ Βακχεύς, ὁ μάντις (Frag. 341).’” Further on, 1, 18, 17, Macrobius cites a verse of ‘Orpheus’:

**Ηλιος*, ὃν Διόνυσον ἐπίκλησιν καλέουσιν (Abel's *Orphica*, Frag. 169; cp. also Abel's Frag. 7). The worship of Dionysus Sebadius as Helios by the Thracians (Alexander Polyhistor, *F. H. G.* 3. 244, 151) may be the cause or the effect of this assimilation. Sophocles in his *Tereus* (Frag. 523) has **Ηλιε*, φιλίπποις Θρηξὶ πρέσβιστον σέλας.—Orphic documents in a Thracian sanctuary of Dionysus were mentioned by Heraclides (Schol. Eur. *Alc.* 968). Female worshippers of Orpheus and Dionysus are referred to in Plutarch, *Alex.* 2.—On Orphic myths see Maass, *Orpheus*, pp. 129 f.

ἀργυρήλατον: the silver mines of Mt. Pangaeus are mentioned by Herod. 7. 112, deposits of silver in Thrace by Herod. 5. 17, 5. 23, Eur. *Rhes.* 970, Strabo 7. 331, Frag. 34. Most of the S. E. corner of Macedonia was rich in both silver and gold, though the ancients naturally make more account of the latter metal, e. g., Eur. *Rhes.* 921 ὅτ' ἡλθομεν γῆς χρυσόβωλον ἐς λέπας Πάγγαιον κτλ., Herod. 6. 46, 9. 75, Thuc. 4. 105, Diod. 16. 8, Appian *B. C.* 4. 106.

<*πύμπλησι*>: (cp. *Hymn Demeter* 189) is better than *ἔφλεξε* (cp. Eur. *Tro.* 309).

ἀστραπῆς: of the flashing of torches, as at Eleusis, Aesch. Frag. 386.

πευκᾶν σέλας recalls the MS. reading *Agam.* 288 *πεύκη τὸ χρυσοφεγγές*, ὡς τις ἥλιος, | *σέλας παραγγείλασα*, Soph. *Trach.* 1198 *πευκίης λαμπάδος σέλας*, Eur. *I. T.* 1224 *σέλας λαμπάδων*.

ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΙΟΙ 54 Α

ἄργα τὸ πρᾶγμα, διεμύδαν' ἥδη νέκυς

Didymus on Demosth. *Philipp.* xii (xiii) in the Berlin papyrus (No. 9780), second century after Christ, published in *Berliner Klassikertexte* 1 (1904) pp. 66 f. Col. xiv, ll. 12 ff.: καὶ Αἰσχύλος ἐπὶ τῶν πρὸ τῆς Καδμείας νεκρῶν τῶν πρὸς τὴν ταφὴν ἔτοιμος ἔχόντων· ‘ἄργα—νέκυς.’

That the fragment belongs to the 'Ελευσίνιοι follows from Plutarch's *Theseus* 29, where it is set forth that Theseus in conjunction with Adrastus effected the recovery of the bodies of the Argives slain before Thebes, not, as Euripides represented the case in his *Ικέτιδες*, as the result of a victory over the Thebans, but by persuasion.—The graves of the common soldiery

are still shown, Plutarch says, at Eleutherae, while the leaders were buried at Eleusis. The account of Euripides, Plutarch states, is disproved by Aeschylus, in whose Ἐλευσίνοι Theseus is represented as stating these facts.

The Ἐλευσίνοι stood third in the trilogy, whose second member was the Ἀργεῖοι, and the first, in all probability, the Νεμέα. Others approve the group Ἀργεῖοι, Ἐλευσίνοι, Ἐπίγονοι.

ἄργα: the quotation is introduced in the course of a discussion on the meaning of ὄργας, in which Didymus defines ὄργαν as τὸ πρὸς δτιοῦν ὄρμὴν εἰς ἐτομότητα ἔχεν. See on 451 F below. Cp. ὄργα μαθᾶν Cho. 454.

πρᾶγμα: the ‘business,’ the ‘matter in hand.’ Cp. Cho. 872, Eum. 488.

διεμίδαιν': cp. Hesych. μυδαίνει · σήπει and μυδῆσαι · σαπῆναι, Photius μυδᾶν · σήπεσθαι. Soph. Ant. 410 has μυδῶν σῶμα.

ΗΛΙΑΔΕΣ 72

ἄρουσε κρήνης ἀφθονεστέρα λιβάς

Reitzenstein *Index lect.* 1890-91, p. 5, from Vat. Graec. 1818 of the *Etymologicum genuinum*, s. v. ἀφθονεστατον ἀρχέστατον . . . αἰδοιεστατον . . . τὸ ἀφθονεστερον οἷον ὅρα σε κρήνης ἀφθονεστερα λιβασὶ, ταῦτα ποιητικά εἰσιν κατ' ἔθος Ἰώνων γινόμενα (from Philoxenus). Reitzenstein emended ὅρα σε to ἄρουσε, λιβασὶ to ‘λιβάς· Ἡλ<ιάσων>,’ following Athenaeus 10. 424 D: τὸ ἐν Ἡλιάσιν Αἰσχύλον ἀφθονεστερον λιβά. ἀφθονεστέρα is due to Crusius (cp. *Lex. Sabbait.* ἀφθονεστέραν εἶπεν Αἰσχύλος).

ΚΑΒΙΡΟΙ 96 Α

ξυμφορά

Lexicon Cyrilli (Cod. Messanensis S. Salvatoris 167, twelfth cent.), Reitzenstein *Index lect.* 1890-91, p. 5: ξυμφορά · συντυχία · καὶ ἐπὶ ἀγαθοῦ τάσσεται ὡς παρ' Αἰσχύλῳ ἐν Καβείροις (Καμείροις MS., corr. Reitz.) καὶ ἐπὶ κακοῦ παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ.

The definition recalls Diogenian; cp. Hesychius ξυμφορά · συντυχία · καὶ ἐπὶ ἀγαθοῦ τάσσεται καὶ ἐπὶ κακοῦ. Eustathius 647. 37 καὶ ἡ συμφορά δὲ οὐ μόνον ἀπογρόπαιος ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀγαθή, κτλ. The original neutral sense of συμφορά (schol. Aristoph. Eq. 655 μέσον δὲ ὄνομα ἡ συμφορά) appears both in Ionic (Herod. 7. 49) and in Attic. Used of a happy event, the word is more common in Aeschylus

than in Sophocles (*El.* 1230). It occurs in that sense, e. g., in Simonides 14, Euripides *Ale.* 1155, *Ion* 536.

ΜΥΣΟΙ 145 Α

εἶδον καλπάζοντας ἐν αἰχμαῖς

Photius ed. Reitzenstein 113. 14: ἀνακαλπάζει · τινὲς μὲν ὡς οὐ δόκιμον ἔφυλάξαντο τὴν φωνήν, Αἰσχύλος δὲ ἔχρήσατο Μυσοῦς ὡς δόκιμον · λέγει γάρ · ‘εἶδον -- αἰχμαῖς.’ ὁμοίως Σοφοκλῆς, ‘Αριστοφάνης καὶ Πλάτων καὶ ἔτεροι. Because of the use of *τὴν φωνήν*, Reitzenstein thinks the passage is probably derived from Phrynicus' Σοφιστικὴ προπαρασκενή (Frag. 181 de Borries). Cp. Bekker *Anecd.* 5. 25, 9. 12, 67. 20, etc.

It is not surprising to find mention of the gait of a horse in the author of the passage *Cho.* 794 ff.; but whether trotting or galloping is here meant is uncertain. Pausanias 5. 9. 1-2 refers to the *κάλπης δρόμος* with mares at Olympia, in the last course of which the riders leaped down and ran beside their horses, still holding on to their bridles, “just as the ‘Mounters’ still do”; and in Plutarch *Alex.* 6 παρακαλπάσας probably means ‘running alongside.’ *ἀνακαλπάζειν* is attested for the first time in Photius. For late testimony as to the simple verb see *Hippiatrica* 120, 128.

The passage is lyric. Reitzenstein suggests ἄδων (ending a glyconic) with the remainder as a second pherecratic.

ΝΕΑΝΙΣΚΟΙ 149 Α

πρὸς δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀμφιλαφῇ πήματ' ἔχων ἀθανάτων

Photius ed. Reitzenstein 102. 13: ἀμφιλαφῇ κακά · ξένως εἴρηται Αἰσχύλως Νεανίσκοις · ‘πρὸς . . . ἀθανάτων.’

For ξένως *b* has Αξένως (cp. 100. 10 Αοῖον in *b* for *οῖον*). The passage, according to Reitzenstein, probably comes from Dorotheos, who is cited in *Et. Magn.* 87. 49, Phot. 92. 9. In Photius *Bibl.* cod. 156 mention is made of ξένως εἴρημέναι λέξεις, of which Dorotheos may have been the compiler.

πρός : probably to be taken adverbially. Cp. *Prom.* 73, 929 (*πρὸς δὲ*), *Cho.* 301. ἐπὶ τοῖς: as ω 277. ἀμφιλαφῇ: *Ag.* 1015, *Cho.* 331; ἀμφιλαφές · πολὺ καὶ ἀφθονον *Timaeus Lex.* *Plat.* Metre: choriambic tetrameter, cp. *Pers.* 633-634 = 640-641 (with unusual caesura).

NIOBH 167 A (*Αδηλον 419)

αὐλῶν

Schol. (Cod. Laur. 86, 7) on Aelian *H. A.* 6. 11, p. 143. 20
 αὐλῶνες οἱ ἐπ' εὐθείας τόποι Αἰσχύλος Νιόβη (αισχυνόβη MS.). καὶ τὴν
 τάφρον δ' αὐλῶνα ὁ αὐτός. See De Stefanī in *Stud. ital. di fil. cl. 7*
 (1899) 414. Cp. Hesychius αὐλῶνες · οἱ ἐπ' εὐθείας τόποι. φάραγγες.
 <ἢ> τόποι πλατεῖς ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη, and αὐλῶνα · Αἰσχύλος καὶ τὴν τάφρον
 καὶ τὴν πυράν. Eustathius 1157. 36 Αἰσχύλος δέ φησι καὶ τὴν τάφρον
 αὐλῶνα. Cp. Frag. inc. 326.

ΞΑΝΤΡΙΑΙ 172 A (*Αδηλον 413)

ἀναγκόδακρυς

Ascribed simply to Aeschylus by Phrynicus in Bekker *Anecd.*
 20. 13; Αἰσχύλος Ξαντρίας Photius ed. Reitzenstein 108. 12. Cp.
Agam. 794 ἀγέλαστα πρόσωπα βιαζόμενοι.

ΟΠΛΩΝ ΚΡΙΣΙΣ 178 A

καὶ διὰ πνευμόνων θερμὸν ἀησιν ὕπνον

Photius ed. Reitzenstein 39. 7 : ἀησιν · ἀναπνεῖ. Αἰσχύλος ἐν
 'Οπλων κρίσει · 'καὶ . . . ὕπνον.'

Cp. ἀησιν · ἀναπνεῖ Bekk. *Anecd.* 349. 2 from the sixth *Lexicon Seguerianum*, Συναγωγὴ λέξεων χρογίμων, which is based on a Cyril-glossary, and known to be an immediate source of Photius. Elsewhere I find this explanation only in the (confused) scholium ἀναπνέει, ἀνατέλλει on Oppian *Hal.* 1. 154 ὅσσον ἀησιν ἐπὶ χρόνον ἄγριος ἀστήρ. ἀναπνεῖ may have the signification either of ἐκπνεῖ or of εἰσπνεῖ. So far as I can discover, ἀησιν is used only in this passage of Aeschylus with reference to respiration; but a like assimilation to the kindred idea of πνέω is seen in the encroachment of *flare* on the sphere of *spirare*, though the Latin verbs have more points of connection than the Greek verbs. L. and S. would apparently restrict the range of πνέω (used of physical breath) to 'breathing hard,' 'panting,' which is the force of ἀσθμαίνω in the passage (K 496) describing the nightmare of Rhesus; and it is not impossible that in the quotation from Aeschylus ἀησιν may have such a meaning, especially if the verse has reference to the fevered sleep of Ajax preceding or following his madness consequent upon the unjust award to

Odysseus of the arms of Achilles. But the restriction of the Lexicon is ill-advised. *πνέοντε* in N 387, it is true, does refer to the hard breathing of horses (cp. P 501), but *Cho.* 621 ff., the other passage cited, is not in point: *Νίσον ἀθανάτας τριχὸς | νοσφίσασ' ἀπροβούλως | πνέονθ' ἀ κυνόφρων ὑπνῳ*. Here, to my feeling, *πνέονθ'* *ὑπνῳ* has greater pathos than *εῦδοντα*, so that, for the point in question, the retention of *ἀπροβούλως* and the rejection of Porson's *νοσφίσασα προβούλως*, is immaterial, though on other grounds I have no hesitation in taking the adverb with *πνέονθ'* *ὑπνῳ*. Nisus lay breathing unsuspectingly in sleep when his immortal locks were shorn by his daughter, who had none of the compunction of Lady Macbeth: "Had he not resembled my father as he slept, I had done 't." The locution *ἄησιν ὑπνον* is more striking and more vigorous than *πνέονθ'* *ὑπνῳ*, and the stronger verb is suited to fevered sleep (cp. *θερμαὶ νόσοι*, Pind. *Pyth.* 3. 66). The construction recalls Theocr. 24. 47 *δμῶας δὴ τότ' ἄνσεν ὑπνον βαρὺν ἐκφυσῶντας*, Verg. *Aen.* 9. 326 toto proflabat pectore somnum (a periphrasis for 'snoring,' as Servius thinks it necessary to inform us), imitated in Statius *Theb.* 2. 76 anhelum proflabant sub luce deum, Maximianus *Eleg.* 4. 41 toto me pectore somnum prospicit efflantem, and Propertius 1. 3. 7 talis visa mihi mollem spirare quietem Cynthia. It will be observed that these examples are parallels in construction to *ἄησιν ὑπνον*, not to *πνέονθ'* *ὑπνῳ*.

Further confirmation of the use of *ἄημι* in the meaning 'breathe' may be sought in the etymologically connected *ἀάζω* (*ἀ-ρα-δ-ζω*), which appears only in Aristotle's *Meteor.* 367 b 2 (Fobes' text) and in the pseudo-Aristotelian *Probl.* 964 a 10 ff., where a distinction is set up between *φυσῶ* 'expel the breath in puffs' and *ἀάζω* 'expel the breath in a single expiration (*hiante ore*).'¹ In the first of these passages Aristotle says οὐ δοκοῦσι δὲ οἱ ἀνεμοὶ εἶναι θερμοὶ διὰ τὸ κινεῖν τὸν ἀέρα πλήρη πολλῆς ὄντα καὶ ψυχρᾶς ἀτμίδος, ὥσπερ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ διὰ τοῦ στόματος φυσώμενον· καὶ γὰρ τοῦτο ἐγγύθεν μὲν ἔστι θερμόν, ὥσπερ καὶ ὅταν ἀάζωμεν, ἀλλὰ δι' ὀλιγότητα οὐχ ὄμοιώς ἐπιδηλον, πόρρωθεν δὲ ψυχρὸν διὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αἰτίαν τοῦ ἀνέμους (cp. Alex. *Aphrod. Probl.* 1. 65 p. 106). In the latter passage we read: διὰ τί ἐκ τοῦ στόματος καὶ θερμὸν καὶ ψυχρὸν πνέοντι; φυσῶντι μὲν γὰρ ψυχρόν, ἀάζοντι δὲ θερμόν. σημεῖον δὲ ὅτι θερμαίνει, ἐὰν πλησίον προσάγῃ τις τὴν χεῖρα τοῦ στόματος. η ἀμφοτέρως ὁ ἀήρ κινούμενος ψυχρός· ὁ δὲ φυσῶν κινεῖ τὸν

ἀέρα οὐκ ἀθρόως, ἀλλὰ διὰ στενοῦ τοῦ στόματος · ὀλίγον οὖν ἐκπνέων πολὺν κινέ τὸν θύραθεν, ἐν φὶ τὸ θερμὸν δὲν τὸ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος οὐ φάνεται δι' ὀλιγότητα. ὁ δὲ ἀάζων ἀθρόου ἐκπνεῖ · διὸ θερμόν. ἔστι γὰρ φυσασμοῦ τῷ (τὸ?) διαφέρειν τῇ συστροφῇ · οὐδὲ ἀσπόδεθρού ἐκπνευσίς.

While *ἀάζω* thus in a measure supports the use of *ἄημι* ‘breathe,’ it may be doubted whether it is an old formation. The absence of contraction suggests the influence of *ἄημι* and the termination has a late look. Additional confirmation of *ἄημι* meaning ‘breathe’ is not to be sought, with Curtius *Etymol.*⁵ 387, in the substantive *ἀσθμα*, as it is commonly accented. Were this accent correct we should expect *ἀεσθμα* in Homer. Hero-dian, however, wrote *ἀσθμα* and the word, instead of being connected with *ἄημι*, has other possible derivations, the most probable being from *√an* in *ἀνεμος*.

The verb *ἄζω*, which was used by the comic poet Nicochares (Kock 1. 774, Frag. 19) according to Bekker *Anecd.* 348. 18 (cp. Hesychius and Photius 38. 4 Reitz.) in the same meaning as *ἀάζω* (*τὸ διὰ τοῦ στόματος ἀθρόως ἐκπνεῖν ἄζειν λέγοντιν Ἀττικοί*), is simply onomatopoetic and therefore unconnected with *ἀάζω*; as is indicated by the further statement in the definition: *μυμούμενοι τὸν ἥχον τοῦ πνεύματος*. *ἄζω* is to utter the sound *ā* (cp. *οἰμώζω*, *φεύζω*, etc.) in a total exhalation of breath or to ‘groan’ as in Sophocles (Hesychius, Photius *l. l.*). Eustathius 983. 65 (on Ε 261) says *ἄζειν τὸ ἀθρόως προσπνεῖν τῷ στόματι θερμόν*, possibly through muddling the verb with *ἄζειν* ‘parch’ or by recollection of Aristotle’s definition of *ἀάζειν*. See also the confused statement in Suidas, *s. v. ἥλος*.

Metre: a dochmiac (— u u — u — as *Sept.* 234 and often) followed by — u u — u u, apparently not a dochmiac. At least this form is (despite Seidler § 28) probably not found elsewhere in Aeschylus; and is very rare in Sophocles (*O. T.* 1345).

FINEYE 258 A

ἀνηστις δ' οὐκ ἀποστατεῖ γόος

Etymol. genuinum, *s. v. ἀνηστις* · ὁ ἀστος. Κρατίνος ἐν Διονυσαλεξανδρῷ ‘φοιτᾶς ἐπὶ δεῖπνον ἀνηστις’ (Frag. 45 Kock) καὶ Αἰσχύλος ἐν Φυεῖ ‘ἀνηστις — γόος’ (ἐν - - - γόος om. B).

The trimeter lacks, for its first foot, a word of iambic value to be taken closely with *ἀνηστις*.—Aeschylus is fond of *ἀποστατῶ*. Reitzenstein compares Frag. 301 *ἀπάτης δικαίας οὐκ ἀποστατεῖ θεός*.

FINEYE 258 B

ἀρπαγοι χεροῖν

Schol. on Hom. *Il. H* 76 in *Oxyrh. Pap.* 1087. 3, Vol. 8 (1911) 103, late first century B. C.: τὸ ἄρπαγος, ἐνθεν ἐπλήθυνεν Αἰσχύλος ἐν Φινεῖ ‘ἄρπαγοι χ<ε>ροῖν,’ καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Φινεῖ α' ‘χεροῖν ἄρπάγοις.’

ἄρπαγος for ἄρπαξ is thus shown not to be a ‘forma recentioris Graecismi,’ as it was described by Dindorf in the Thesaurus on the basis of the only occurrences then known (Scholia Dorvilliana on Aristoph. *Plut.* 800, Arcadius 102. 9). For the shift to the O-declension, cp. φύλαξ φυλακός, ψάρψ φαρός, κίνδυνος, μάρτυρ μάρτυρος, τέρην τέρενος. From *Eum.* 50 it is clear that Aeschylus represented the Harpies as winged women, as they are depicted in archaic and classical art, and probable that he conceived them as having human hands, though χεροῖν in the fragment is not decisive on the latter point. Apoll. Rhod. 2. 188 regards the Harpies as having γαμφηλαί, a conception that must be Hellenistic as well as Roman.

ΨΥΧΟΣΤΑΣΙΑ 280 A

ὅα

Lexicon Messanense de iota ascripto (a fragment of *Orus περὶ δρθογραφίας*), published by Rabe in *Rhein. Mus.* 47 (1892) 404-413 from Cod. S. Salvatoris 118 (thirteenth century) in the Royal Library at Messina, fol. 283 verso, l. 3: <... καὶ συνα-> λοιφῇ <ῳ. ἔστι δὲ> καὶ διὰ μόνου τοῦ ὅ, ἡ <ὅα. Αἰσχύλος> Ψυχοστασίᾳ.

Heretofore attested only in the *Persae* and called Περσικὸν θρήνημα by the scholiast of the Medicean on verse 117. In each of the six occurrences of the word, M has ὅα, the Farnese MS. (Triclinius) ὁά, and so apparently the other later MSS., though explicit statements are lacking.

ΑΔΗΛΩΝ ΔΡΑΜΑΤΩΝ

319

<εἶ>τ' οὐν ἀσαλῆς θέοθεν μανία

Etymol. genuinum s. v. ἀσαλῆς · ὁ ἀφρόντιστος¹ ἡ ἡ μηδενὸς φροντίζουσα. Αἰσχύλος τουνασαλῆς θέοθεν μανίαο.² εἴρηται δὲ παρὰ τὴν σάλην

ἢ σημαίνει τὴν φροντῖδα, ἀσαλῆς ὁ ἀμέριμνος. οὕτως Ἡρωδιανὸς καὶ Ἀπολλόδωρος. καὶ γὰρ ἀσαλέαν Σώφρων τὴν ἀμεριμνίαν καὶ ἀλογιστίαν καλεῖ.

ἀσαλῆς μανία. ἢ μηδενὸς φροντίζουσα. σάλη γὰρ ἡ φροντίς· οὕτως Αἰσχύλος. ἐκ τοῦ λεξικοῦ τοῦ ῥητορικοῦ.³

1 ἄφροντις AB. 2 Αἰσχύλος—μανία om. B. 3 ἐκ—ῥητορικοῦ om. B. The ‘Rhetorical Lexicon’ is Bekker’s sixth *Lexicon Seguerianum*, *Sυναγωγὴ λέξεων χρησίμων*, ep. *Anecd.* 450. 28.

The first gloss appears in the *Etymologicum Magnum* (151. 49), which took over much material in a reduced form from the *Etymologicum genuinum*. To complete the anapaestic dimeter Nauck (*Tragicae dictionis index*) read εἰτ'. Reitzenstein, rejecting Ιοῦν, suggested υ υ νοῦν.

354

Etymol. genuinum s. v. ἀπάργματα (schol. on Apoll. Rhod. 4. 477). . . . ἦν γάρ τι νόμιμον τοῖς δολοφονήσασιν ἀφοσιῶσαι τὸν φόνον δὰ τοῦ δολοφονηθέντος ἀκρωτηριασμοῦ . . . ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἔγεινοτο τοῦ αἵματος καὶ ἀπέπτυνον Αἰσχύλος ἐν ταῖς Περραιβίσιν ιστορεῖ καὶ ἐν τῷ περὶ Λατίου. B omits ὅτι—Λατίου. A has τοῖς πρὸσλέβισιν and τῷ θλατίῳ: (ἐν τῷ Λατίῳ? Reitz.).

The notice of the *Etymol. genuinum*, more explicit than that of the *Etymol. Magn.* 118. 31, rendered it possible for Reitzenstein to refer Frag. 354 ἀποπτύσσαι δεῖ καὶ καθήρασθαι στόμα either to the Περραιβίδες (186 A) or to the Δάϊος (122 A).

403, New Fragment (403 A), 284

Βοῦράν θ' οἱράν καὶ κεραυνίας Τόπας
Δύμην <θ'> Ἐλίκην ἥδ' Αἴγειραν
τὴν τ' αἰπεινὴν ζαθέαν Ὄλενον

V. 1 (Frag. 403) from Strabo 8. 387 (Cod. Vat. Palimpsest.).
Vv. 2, 3, according to Strazzulla *dopo lo Strabone del Cozza-Luzzi* (Messina, 1901, p. 31), with the reading Δύμην <Ε>λίκην Αἴγειραν ἥ δ' Αἴγέα <χώ>ραν τὴν ταπεινὴν ζαθέαν Ὄλενον, emended by Wilamowitz in *Hermes* 40 (1905) 131. V. 3 (Frag. 284) from Steph. Byz. 707. 13.—The fragment presents a strange combination of trochaics with anapaests. ὄρείαν (rejected by Wilamowitz) for οἱράν would help V. 1 (though such close association of iambic trimeter and anapaestic dimeter would be unusual), and provide an appropriate designation for the massive

hill or mountain of Bura (*Idra*). If *ιεράν* is correct, the epithet may be due to the worship of Heracles there.

451 A

ἀϊδνόν

Photius ed. Reitzenstein 47. 12: ἀϊδνόν: (ἄϊδνον b) · τὸ ἀφανιστικόν. οὕτως Αἰσχύλος.

Cp. Hesychius ἄϊδνον (*sic*): μέλαν ἡ ἀφανιστικόν, and ἀϊδνή· σκοτεινή. ἀφανιστικός is used in Schol. Aesch. *Theb.* 145 (Δύκεος γενοῦ) and Schol. *Pers.* 257 (δάïa). ἀϊδνός appears in the MSS. of Hesiod *Theog.* 860 οὔρεος ἐν βήσσογριν ἀϊδνῆς παιπαλοέσσης, where its meaning seems to be 'dim,' 'dark' (Schol. ταῖς ἀφανέσσι) or, possibly, 'boundless.' On the authority of two MSS., Viteb. 2 and 3, of Tzetzes on Lycophron *Alex.* 688, Flach and Rzach adopt Αἴτιης and παιπαλοέσσης. An unknown melic poet (possibly Pindar) has νικτὸς ἀϊδνᾶς κοίρανος, Bergk *P. L. G.* 3. 719, Apoll. Rhod. 1. 329 ἀϊδνὴ λιγνής, which recalls λιγνὺν μέλαιναν *Sept.* 494.

451 B

ἄμαξα

Photius ed. Reitzenstein 86. 24: <ἄ>μαξα · ἡ ναῦς παρὰ τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς, καὶ ίσως εἰκάζοντιν αὐτὴν ἀμάξη ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀμάν τὴν θάλασσαν. ἡ λέξις παρ' Αἰσχύλῳ.

Aeschylus will not have used *ἄμαξα* for 'ship' without some defining addition in the form of an adjective or genitive; cp. ξνν ὅχω ταχνήρει *Suppl.* 32, λινόπτερα ναυτίλων ὄχηματα *Prom.* 468, νάιον ὅχημα *Eur. I. T.* 410, ὅχημα ναός *Soph. Tr.* 656, ναῖαν ἀπήνην *Eur. Med.* 1122, πλωταῖς ἀπήναισι *Bergk P. L. G.* Adesp. 117 = Nauck *T. G. F.* Adesp. 142, 'volitantem flamine currum' Catullus 64. 9. Cp. ἀλὸς ἵπποι δ 708.

451 C

ἀμαρτάδας

Photius ed. Reitzenstein 88. 7: ἀμαρτάδας (ἀμάρτημον b) · Αἰσχύλος καὶ ἀμάρτια Πλάτων (Comicus).

Cp. Hesychius ἀμαρτάδας · ἀμαρτίας; Suidas ἀμαρτίαν οἱ Ἀττικοι, ἀμαρτάδα Ἡρόδοτος (1. 91, 8. 140. 1) καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι Ἱωνες (Hippocrates 2. 306 Littré).

451 D

ἀμυνάνδρως

Photius ed. Reitzenstein 96. 15 : ἀμυνάνδρως · Αἰσχύλος, ἀμύνανδρον
δὲ Σοφοκλῆς.

Cp. Hesychius ἀμύνανδρος · δυνάμενος ἄνδρας ἀμίνεσθαι.

451 E

ἀμυντρόν

Photius ed. Reitzenstein 96. 15 : ἀμυντρόν καὶ ἀμυνάνδρως
Αἰσχύλος.

ἀμύντωρ is Epic, Lyric, and Tragic, ἀμυντήρ is Aristotelian.

451 F

ὅργαζω

Photius ed. Reitzenstein 64. 7 : ἀκοῦσαι ὅργῳ · . . . σημαίνει δὲ
τὸ ὅργαν <τὸ> πάνυ ἐπαύρεσθαι πρὸς τὸ πρᾶξαι τι ἡ ἀκοῦσαι (ср.
Bekk. *Anecd.* 7. 3). καθόλον δὲ ποιῶντας χρῶνται τῷ ὄνόματι · καὶ
γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῦ βρέξαι, ὡς Ἀρχῖλοχος, Αἰσχύλος δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ παίοντα ἔξελαν-
νειν καὶ μαλάττειν τίθησι, Σοφοκλῆς δὲ ἐν Αἴγαι <φησι> τὸν Θησέα
στρέφοντα καὶ μαλάττοντα τοὺς λύγους ποιῆσαι δεσμὰ τῷ ταύρῳ · λέγει
δὲ οὕτως · ‘κλωστῆροι χειρῶν ὅργάσας κατήνυσε σειρᾶν δεσμά’ (Frag.
25 Jebb-Pearson, ср. 482, 787). καὶ Ἡρόδοτος δὲ ἐν τετάρτῳ (64)
ἀντὶ τοῦ μαλάξας κέχρονται τῷ ὅργάσας κτλ. From Phrynicus'
Σοφιστικὴ προπαρασκευή.

It cannot be determined from Photius whether Aeschylus used ὅργαζω or ὅργῳ in the meaning 'soften.' Elsewhere at least the former verb is generally employed in this sense. In Herod. 4. 64, cited by L. and S. for ὅργῳ 'tan,' ὅργάσας is adopted by the most recent editors from A² B², R having ὅργῆσας, the other MSS. ὅργίσας. Hesychius has, however, ὑποργηθεῖσα· ὑποχρισθεῖσα. See Timaeus' *Lexicon* ed. Ruhnken, pp. 179, 193.

451 G

ἀκμήν δ' ὄσα

τὰ κύμβαλ' ἡχεῖ

Lexicon Vaticanum (Cod. Vat. graec. 12, fifteenth century), Reitzenstein in *Index lectionum* 1892-93, p. 4, 8 : ἀκμήν · ἐπιρρημα-
<τικῶς> Αἰσχύλος καὶ Μένανδρος · 'ἀκμήν δὲ ὄσα τὰ κύμβαλα ἡχεῖ'
καὶ 'ἀκμήν ἐκένος ἐνσκενάζετο,' Κρατῖνος μέντοι τῷ ἀκμήν ἐπιρρηματικῶς
μέν, ἀντὶ <δὲ> τοῦ ἀκμαίως ἔχοντα.

ἀκμήν in the signification of *ἔτι* is stated to occur in no Attic writer except Xenophon by Phrynicus, Moeris, and Thomas Magister; and this use is generally regarded by the ancient Atticists as characteristic of the later language. Suidas, however, appeals to Sophocles *Phil.* 12 (wrongly) and to Hyperides; and the Antiatticista (Bekk. 77) makes the same claim for the orator, whose extant works do not contain the word.

Lobeck (*Phrynicus* 123) contends that *ἀκμήν* has two chief significations, which are often confused: (1) the older and original meaning = *ἄρτι* 'just now' and (2) the later meaning 'still.' This is disputed by Krumbacher in *Kuhn's Zeitschrift* 27 (1884) 506, and to the effect that the only meaning is 'still,' even in Xen. *Anab.* 4, 3, 26 and Isocr. 1, 3, where the text is often changed.

451 H

... ν>εότικτα δ' ὑπὸ . . . ηρο . . . εικορω

Demetrius Lacon, the Epicurean, in *Pap. Hercul.* 1012, col. 23: καὶ Ἀριστο<φάνης ὁ γ>ραμ<μα>τικὸς εὖ<ρε πα>ρ' Αἰσχύλῳ τοῦτ' ἐν . . . ν>εότικτα δ' ὑπὸ . . . ΗΡΟ . . . ΕΙΚΟΡΩ.

See Crönert in Wessely's *Studien zur Paläographie und Papyruskunde* 6 (1906) 120. Crönert thinks the title of Demetrius' treatise was possibly Περὶ τινων ἀλόγων Ἐπικούρῳ προστετριμένων.

451 I

. . . . ων δυσκελάδων

Anon. on Metres in *Ovyrh. Pap.* cccx, col. xi. 2, vol. 2 (1899) p. 46, probably from the early part of the second century B. C.: ὅποιον ἐν τῷ Προμηθεῖ τίθησι πάλιν Αἰσχύ<λος ο>ῦτως . . . < . . . > ων δυσκελάδων.'

<τ>άδε πάσχειν ἔθέλεις in the same passage may also, as Grenfell and Hunt suggest, be taken from Aeschylus. The meter is u u - u u -, called in col. xii the Parthenean.—From the Προμηθεὺς Λυόμενος, Πυρφόρος, or Πυρκαεύς the satyr-play of the trilogy Φινέύς, Πέρσαι, Γλαῦκος. Wilamowitz conjectures <έρι>δων.

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

II.—EPICUREAN DETERMINISM IN THE ÆNEID.

Vergil was somewhat over twenty years of age when, caught in the intellectualistic movement then sweeping Italy, he threw aside his law studies and fled to Naples where Siro and Philodemus were planting the “garden” of Epicurus.

Nos ad beatos vela mittimus portus
Magni petentes docta dicta Sironis.

Of the life in the garden, where he now remained for many years, we catch just a glimpse here and there in the fragments of Philodemus, who once speaks of those that “gather at Naples to lead the life of philosophic inquiry with Siro at Herculaneum,” and again, probably after Siro’s death, addresses among his own listeners several of Vergil’s friends by name, including apparently the poet himself.¹ It is doubtless this community of students that Cicero has in mind when in the *De Fin.* I, 65, he says: “At vero Epicurus . . . quam magnos quantaque amoris conspiratione consentientes tenuit amicorum greges! *Quod fit etiam nunc ab Epicureis.*

In the Ciris Vergil called this school the *Cecropius hortulus*. The term was appropriate since after the death of Phaedrus when Patro had not been strong enough to uphold the position of the Athenian *Kīros*² the prestige of the school had gone westward with all else, and Siro and Philodemus, the leaders of the Syrian branch of the school, had succeeded in founding a new home at Naples. Vergil’s sixth Eclogue, addressed to a fellow-student Quintilius Varus, is a fitting tribute to his master:

Namque canebat uti magnum per inane coacta
Semina terrarumque animaeque marisque fuissent.

The music of that song of creation the poet never forgot.

Nevertheless, Vergilian commentators noticing the Stoic imagery and phraseology of the eschatological passage in the sixth book of the Æneid have generally concluded that Vergil in his mature years rejected the Epicurean for the Stoic faith.

¹ See Hendrickson, Am. Jour. Phil. 1918, p. 35.

² Cf. Cic. Ad Fam. XIII 1.

Such is the view held for instance by Norden in his edition of the sixth book: "Vergil's youth fell in the enthusiastic days of the revolution; at that time he like thousands of others thought that he could find a retreat from the storms of life in the peaceful harbor of the Epicurean philosophy. But through the Augustan restoration the world seemed to be placed upon surer foundations again. . . . And so Vergil like many others turned from a *negative* to a positive faith."³ Sellar, Conington, Heinze and Glover also assume in their Vergilian studies that Vergil subsequently adopted Stoicism. A more consistent interpretation of the *Aeneid* seems to me attainable on the hypothesis that the eschatological scene of the sixth book—which by the way is hardly Stoic—was adopted as a *mythos* for purposes of plot, and that the poet continued, while writing the *Aeneid*, in the faith which he had avowed with enthusiasm in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*.

To call the Epicureanism of Vergil's youth a "negative" creed as compared with Stoicism, is not this to miss completely its significance to the Romans? Our sophisticated age readily puts its finger upon the flaws of Epicurean logic, and our scientists express amazement at the Master's ignorance of Physics. But the Roman neophyte must be judged from his own past and not from the viewpoint of the modern expert. Untrained in metaphysical practice, ignorant of the tools and methods of exact science he had been granted no answers to his growing curiosity about nature except those offered by a naïve mythology which necessarily vanished into mists at the first critical inspection. Stoicism had first been brought over by Greek teachers as a possible guide, but the Roman, now trained by his extraordinary career in world politics to think in terms of experience, could have but little patience with a metaphysical system which constantly took refuge in a faith in aprioristic logic that had already been successfully challenged by two centuries of skeptics. The Epicurean at least kept his feet on the ground, appealed to the practical man's faith in his own senses and plausibly propped his hypotheses with analogous illustrations, oftentimes approaching very close to the cogent methods

³ Norden, *Aeneis*, Buch VI, p. 4, cf. p. 153.

of a new inductive logic.⁴ He rested his case at least on the processes of argumentation that the Roman daily applied in the law courts and the Senate and not to flights of metaphysical reasoning. He came with a gospel of illumination to a race eager for light, opening vistas into an infinity of worlds marvelously created by processes that the average man beheld in his daily walks. Could anything be more "positive" than this?

If it be objected that the end of all was fatalism, Vergil may well have answered that he had nowhere else been offered anything but fatalism; his native orthodoxy had never pretended to grant anything but a crude animism that expressed its theory of after-life in an annual offering of milk and wine to spirits that appeared in serpents' form to drink the offering, while Stoicism held to an irrefragable causal nexus and a final nirvana that offered scant satisfaction to the inbred Roman love of Gloria. Epicureanism at least made some account of man as a free agency while life lasted.

To the early Roman devotee also the ethical prejudice against Epicureanism seemed of little moment since his ethics had never before been necessarily dependent upon his creed. Its sanction rested rather on his ideas of family relationships, his view of his position in the state, and in his constitutional inheritance. He had never been taught to look to his religion or his philosophy to guide his conduct. And if the criticism were pressed home, it satisfied his sense of reason to appeal to the exemplary life of Epicurus himself. The works of Lucretius show how oblivious the Roman could be of the implication of immorality that the Greeks attached to this faith; could any pagan reveal a more genuine enthusiasm for righteousness than he?

Furthermore it is very doubtful whether the Romans gave much attention to the claim of Epicureanism to free men from the dread of hell. That fear could hardly have had any significance to a people whose religion did not even recognize it. Lucretius does indeed repeat his Master's words in this respect, but he may have been induced by the fallacious supposition that man's defensive instincts were somehow connected with a fear

⁴ Cicero calls the inductive method *similitudine et transitione percipere* (*De Nat. Deor.* I 105) translating the Greek phrase *μεράβασις καθ' ὁμοιότητα* of the Epicureans.

of punishment, or he may have spent much time of his life at the school at Naples where one observed Greeks rather than Romans. Later the striking poetry of Lucretius' third book must have kept the argument alive at Rome, but its recurrence must be viewed rather as a literary reminiscence than as a sound observation based on Roman experience. This aspect of the new creed could hardly have been the real source of fascination to the Romans.

It was rather the capacity of the Epicurean philosophy to free the imagination, to lift man out of a trivial mythology into a world of infinite visions, and to satisfy man's curiosity regarding the universe with tangible answers that attracted⁵ the Romans of Vergil's day to the new philosophy. Their experience was not unlike that of numberless men of the last generation who first escaped from the puerile cosmology of nonconformist orthodoxy by way of popularized versions of Darwinism pronounced by the experts indeed as pseudoscientific and wholly inadequate in logic. It was in fact the very positivism of Epicureanism that attracted the thousands of Romans. There is no suspicion of "negation" in the tribute to Siro in the sixth Eclogue, nor in the paean to Epicurus in the Georgics. And even in the *Aeneid* when in search of a worthy theme for the banquet of Dido, the poet gives to Iopas the song of creation that Siro had sung.

Vergil was forty years of age, and not many from his death, when he published the Georgics, and the repetition of his creed in the first *Aeneid* ought to warn us that his enthusiasm for the study of *Rerum natura* did not die. Indeed the *Aeneid* is full of Epicurean phrases and notions. The atoms of fire are struck out of the flint (VI, 6), the atoms of light are emitted from the sun (VII, 527, and VIII, 23), early men were born *duro robore* and lived like those described in the fifth book of Lucretius (VIII, 320), there are still compliments for Memmius (V, 117), and Conington finds almost two hundred reminiscences of Lucretius in the *Aeneid*, the proportion increasing rather than decreasing in the later books.⁶

⁵ Cf. Benn, *The Greek Philosophers*,² pp. 403, 454.

⁶ Servius VI 264, makes the explicit statement: *ex maiore parte, Sironem, id est, magistrum Epicureum sequitur.*

It is, however, in the interpretation of the word *fatum* and the rôle played by the gods⁷ that the test of Vergil's philosophy is usually applied. The modern equivalent of *fatum* is, as Guyau⁸ has said, *determinism*. Determinism was accepted by both schools but with a difference. To the Stoic, *fatum* is a synonym of providence whose popular name is Zeus. The Epicurean also accepts *fatum* as governing the universe, but it is not teleological, and Zeus is not identified with it but is, like man, subordinated to it. Again, the Stoic is consistently fatalistic. Even man's moral obligations, which are admitted, imply no real freedom in the shaping of results, for though man has the choice between pursuing his end voluntarily (which is virtue) or kicking against the pricks (which is vice), the sum total of his accomplishments is not altered by his choice: *ducunt volentem fata, nolentem trahunt*. On the other hand, Vergil's teacher, while he affirms the casual nexus for the governance of the universe: *nec sanctum numen fati protollere fines / posse neque adversus naturae foedera niti* (Lucr. V, 309), posits a spontaneous initiative in the soul-atoms of man: *quod fati foedera rumpat / ex infinito ne causam causa sequatur* (Lucr. II, 254). If then Vergil were a Stoic his Jupiter should be omnipotent and omniscient and the embodiment of *fatum*, and his human characters must be represented as devoid of independent power; but such ideas are not found in the *Aeneid*.

Jupiter is indeed called omnipotent at times, but so are Juno and Apollo, which shows that the term must be used in a relative sense. In a few cases he can grant very great powers as when he tells Venus: *Imperium sine fine dedi* (I, 278). But very providence he never seems to be. He draws (*sortitur*) the lots of fate (III, 375), he does not assign them at will, and he unrolls the book of fate and announces what he finds (I, 261).

On VI 11, *mentem animumque*: "nam secundum Lucretium unum est mens et animus."

On VII 4, *si qua est ea gloria*: "secundum Epicureos."

⁷The passages have been analyzed and discussed frequently. See especially Heinze, Vergil's Epische Technik, 290 ff., who interprets Zeus as fate; Matthaei, Class. Quart. 1917, pp. 11-26, who denies the identity; Drachmann, Guderne hos Vergil, 1887; MacInnis, Class. Rev. 1910, p. 160, and Warde Fowler, Aeneas at the site of Rome, pp. 122 ff.

⁸Morale d'Epicure, p. 72.

He is powerless to grant Cybele's prayer that the ships may escape decay:

Cui tanta deo permissa potestas? (IX 97)

He cannot decide the battle between the warriors until he weighs their fates (XII, 725), and in the council of the gods he confesses explicitly his non-interference with the laws of causality:

Sua cuique exorsa laborem
Fortunamque ferent. Rex Jupiter omnibus idem
Fata viam invenient. (X 112)

And here the scholiast naïvely remarks:

Videtur hic ostendisse aliud esse fata, aliud Jovem.⁹

Again, contrary to the Stoic creed, the poet conceives of his human characters as capable of initiating action and even of thwarting fate. Æneas in the second book rushes into battle on an impulse, he could forget his fates and remain in Sicily if he chose (V, 700). He might also remain in Carthage, and explains fully why he does not; and Dido, if left *nescia fati*, might thwart the fates (I, 299), and finally does, slaying herself before her time¹⁰ (IV, 696). The Stoic hypothesis seems to break down completely in such passages.

Can we assume an Epicurean creed with better success? At least in so far as it places the foedera naturae above the Gods and attributes some freedom of will and action to men, for as we have seen in both of these matters Vergil agrees with Lucretius. But there is one apparent difficulty in that Vergil contrary to his teacher's usual practice permits the interference of the gods in human action. The difficulty is, however, only apparent, if,

⁹ Serv. ad loc. MacInnis, Class. Rev. 1910, p. 172, cites several other passages to the point in refutation of Heinze.

¹⁰ See Matthaei, Class. Quart. 1917, p. 19. Care must be observed not to press all the occurrences of *Fatum* and *fata* into philosophical connotations. At times the poet uses the word with his eye upon its derivation from *fari*: cf. *Fabor-fatorum*, I 261, *data fata secutus*, I 382, *fatis incerta feror* IV, 110. In such cases it is a metrical equivalent of "oracles" or "predictions." He also, like many prose writers, used the word in the common sense of bad fortune, or good fortune. Merguet's lexicon of Vergil notes the following meanings: Weissagung, Bestimmung, Geschick, Los, Verhängnis, Unglück.

as Vergil does, we conceive of these gods simply as heroic and superhuman characters in the drama accepted from an heroic age in order to keep the ancient atmosphere in which *Aeneas* had lived in men's imagination ever since Homer first spoke of him. As such characters they have the power of initiative and the right to interfere in action that Epicurus attributes to men, and in so far as they are of heroic stature their actions may be the more effective. So far an Epicurean might well go, and must go in an epic of the heroic age. This is of course not the same as saying that Vergil adopted the gods in imitation of Homer or that he needed Olympic machinery because he supposed it a necessary part of the epic technique. Surely Vergil was gifted with as much critical acumen as Lucan. But he had to accept these creatures as subsidiary characters the moment he chose *Aeneas* as his hero, for *Aeneas* was the son of Venus who dwelt with the celestials at least a part of the time. Her presence in turn involved Juno and Jupiter and the rest of her daily associates. Furthermore, since the tale was of the heroic age of long ago, the characters must naturally behave as the characters of that day were wont to do, and there were old books like Homer and Hesiod from which every schoolboy had become familiar with their behavior. If the poet wished to make a plausible tale of that period he could no more undertake to modernize his characters than could Tennyson in his Idylls. The would-be gods are in the tale not to reveal Vergil's philosophy—they do not—but to orient the reader in the atmosphere in which *Aeneas* had always been conceived as moving.

This comparison of Vergil's artistic conception with that of a modern like Tennyson working in the days of carefully authenticated historical novels may seem drastic, but I think the student of Vergil will agree that the Roman poet, while less afraid of anachronisms than the modern, worked somewhat in the same manner. He deliberately worked up his antiquarian lore¹¹ in every part so as to get a plausible setting for his characters of a bygone age. The seventh and eighth books show how thoroughly he did this for his Italian scenes. On the site of Rome

¹¹ Servius, Bk. VI, praef. *Totus Vergilius scientia plenus est.* It has been noticed that Cicero is also very careful to make the personae of his dialogs speak in character and avoid anachronisms.

Æneas found the cattle grazing in the valley where the forum lay in Vergil's day; the Capitoline hill was still *silvestribus horrida dumis*, though apparently inhabited by a powerful divinity (VIII, 348, 360). The rites being celebrated at his coming were those of the very ancient cults, of the Salii, the Potitii, and the Ara Maxima. The hovels of the city are thatched and the hero is invited to rest on a couch strewn with leaves. In the catalogue of the seventh book the cities of primitive Italy, once great, though mere names in the poet's day, are restored to their old time glory with insistent care. How could he know that the dilapidated and wrecked Praeneste had once extended her dominion over all the territory from Gabii to the river Amasenus unless he had resorted to the city's legends or deliberately inferred such greatness from its extensive walls and from such relics of art as we can now see in the museum of the Valle Giulia. Vanished cities like Antemnae, Crustumerium, Labicum, Saturae, and a score of others are all carefully repeopled in his primitive Italy. Their arms and armor, the bronze and woven-willow shield, the war chariot, the *acydes*, and *cateiae* might in part be suggested by Homeric reminiscences, but most of them are Italic and come from a careful search in Latin books of antiquities or from observing the ancient votive offerings heaped up in temples and the terra cotta revetments of old buildings pictured with processions of mounted and charioted warriors such as the archeologists have recently found in numbers at Rome, Lanuvio, and Velletri. Vergil has even learned that a part of the Faliscan tribe once peopled the ager Falernus near Cumæ (VII, 724), that before the bay-tree was introduced into Latium the poplar wreath was used in ancient cults (Macr. Sat. III, 12, 4, citing Varro), and he seems also to have observed the ancient coin symbols of cities like Carthage, Gela, and Cumæ whose mints had closed long before his day.¹²

Thus the poet deliberately crammed himself with *scientia*, as the puzzled Servius puts it, for the sake of creating a plausible background for his drama. And as he delved in Timaeus, Cato, Varro, and the stores of old art for material with which to recon-

¹² Van Buren, In Num. Chron. X 409 ff.; cf. Aeneid, I 444; III 702-5; VI 171. For the antiquarian studies of Vergil, cf. Ritter, Dissert. Phil. Halenses, 1901. On the enthusiasm for Italian antiquities among Romans of Vergil's day, see Norden, Neue Jahrb. 1901, pp. 249 ff.

struct primitive Latium, he studied the literature of the Homeric age for hints towards the proper staging of *Æneas* and his companions. Had he chosen a contemporary hero or one less blessed with celestial relatives there is no reason to suppose that he would have employed the superhuman personages at all. If this be true it is as uncritical to search for the poet's own conception of divinity in these personages as it would be to infer his taste in furniture from the straw cot which he chooses to give his hero at Evander's hovel. In the epic of primitive Rome the claims of art took precedence over personal creed, and so they would with any true poet; and if any critic were prosaic enough to object, Vergil might have answered with Livy: *Datur haec venia antiquitati ut miscendo humana divinis primordia urbium augustiora faciat*, and if the inconsistency with his philosophy were stressed he could refer to Lucretius' proemium. It is clear then that while the conceptions of destiny and free will found in the *Æneid* are at variance with Stoic creed at every point, they fit readily into the Epicurean scheme of things as soon as we grant what any Epicurean poet would readily grant that the celestials might be employed as characters of the drama if in general subordinated to the same laws of causality and of freedom as were human beings.

What then are we to say of the Stoic coloring of the sixth book? In the first place, it is not actually Stoic. It is, as Norden and others have shown, a syncretism of mystical beliefs developed by Orphic and Apocalyptic poets and mystics from Pythagoras and Plato to a group of Hellenistic writers, popularized by the later less logical Stoic philosophers like Posidonius and gaining in Vergil's day a wide acceptance among those who were growing impatient of the exacting metaphysical processes of thought. Indeed Vergil contributed something toward foisting these beliefs upon early Christianity though they were no more essential to that than to Stoicism.

Be that as it may, this mystical setting was here adopted because the poet needed for his own purposes a vision of incorporated souls of Roman heroes, a thing which neither Epicurean nor orthodox Stoic creed could provide. So he created this *mythos* as Plato for his own purpose created a vision of Er. The dramatic purpose of the *descensus* was of course to complete for *Æneas* the progressive revelation of his mission so skilfully

developed by careful stages all through the third book,¹³ to give the hero his final commands and to inspire him for the final struggle.¹⁴ Then the poet realized that he could at the same time produce a powerful artistic effect upon the reader if he accomplished¹⁵ this by means of a vision of Rome's great heroes presented in review by Anchises from the mount of revelations, for this was an age in which Rome was growing proud of her history. But to do this he must have a *mythos* which assumed that souls lived before their earthly existence. A Homeric limbo of departed souls did not suffice (though Vergil also availed himself of that in order to recall the friends of the early books). With this in view he builds his home of the dead out of what Servius calls much *sapientia*, filling in details here and there even from the legendary lower-world personages so that the reader may meet some familiar faces. It is in creating the atmosphere and peopling the place that he metes out punishment and rewards, based not upon religious sanction, but, as in Lucretius, upon humanitarian considerations, and so incorporates his incisive criticism of life that lifts this poetry far beyond anything uttered at the futile councils of the gods. For here Vergil is dealing with his own creations; there he was tied to creatures made long ago and in whom the Epicurean had little interest. Here again the setting is not to be taken literally, for of course neither he nor anyone else actually believed that prenatal spirits bore the attributes and garments of their future existence, nor is the poet concerned about the eschatology which had to be assumed for the setting; but his judgments on life, though afforded an opportunity to find expression through the characters of the scene, are not allowed to be circumscribed by them: they are his own deepest convictions.

It has frequently been said that Vergil's philosophical system is confused and that his judgments on providence are inconsistent, that in fact he seems not to have thought his problems through. This is of course true so far as it is true of all the students of philosophy of his day. Indeed we must admit that with the very inadequate psychology provided by the aprioristic

¹³ See Heinze, *Epische Technik*, pp. 82 ff.

¹⁴ This Vergil indicates repeatedly: Aen. V 737; VI 718, 806-7, 890-2.

¹⁵ Drachmann, *op. cit.* p. 115.

metaphysics no reasonable solution of the then central problem of determinism could be offered. But if the statement is intended to impugn Vergil's understanding or complete mastery of what the best teachers of his day had to offer, we may well question it in view of his years of communion with Siro and Philodemus.

There are of course passages of Stoic coloring, as for instance the lines in the Georgics that introduce the prognostications (I, 231-51). These have been traced back to astronomical theories which originated in the Stoic lecture room. Here Vergil used for the instruction of the farmer certain parts of Aratus and Eratosthenes on weather wisdom, doubtless knowing as well as the modern critic that these two authors had based their arguments upon astronomical ideas of Zeno. But since those ideas were in no vital degree inconsistent with his views he saw no need of throwing out a picture of poetic value simply because it did not happen to originate with his master. And this illustration will explain most of the passages where Stoic presuppositions are found.

Furthermore the Epicurean school permitted no little latitude to poets in the use of heterodox material. The fragment recently printed by Grenfell and Hunt (Ox. Pap. II, 31) grants that "the wise man will do well sometimes to do homage to the vulgar opinion about the gods," and Lucretius suggests (II, 655) that myths may be used for artistic purposes, a use which he permits himself in the picture of spring (V, 737) which Botticelli illustrated:

*It Ver et Venus, et Veneris praenuntius ante
pennatus graditur, Zephyri vestigia propter
Flora quibus mater praespargens ante viai
cuncta coloribus egregis et odoribus opplet.*

Philodemus also, Vergil's own teacher, is so free in the use of picturesque mythology in his epigrams that the reader would never suspect that in the lecture room he constantly denied divine intervention in human affairs.

Vergil doubtless was a thorough student of the philosophy of his day, and, while recognizing that there were still unsolved problems, was a convinced Epicurean. But he was above all a poet who not only availed himself of the liberties that his school accorded poets, but freely accepted from any source ideas and images that furthered the artistic merits of his epic. The

literary critic need really have little difficulty in distinguishing between his figures of speech and his true convictions if he accepts him as a poet.

In the *Phaedo*, Plato, who had suffered much from unimaginative pupils, warned the reader not to take the "myth" literally. Vergil wisely gave the same warning at the end of his myth, but poetlike made the mistake of involving it in Homeric imagery. Despite the warning and despite the blunt statement of Servius (on VI, 893) that the portal of unreal dreams refers the imagery of the sixth book to fiction, our commentators still continue to deduce from it the articles of Vergil's creed.

TENNEY FRANK.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

III.—NOTES ON THE TEXT OF ASKLEPIODOTOS.

The *Tέχνη Τακτική* of Asklepiodotos, the philosopher, is contained in only a small number of MSS, the oldest, best-known and most accessible of which I shall discuss below. The first five are given the symbols employed by Hermann Köchly.¹

F = Florentinus, i. e. Laurentianus LV, 4, membr., s. X, no. 7, 132a-142b.²

V = Vallicellanus 130, chart., s. XVIII.³

A = Parisinus 2522, chart., s. XV, 52b-77b.⁴

¹ In the first, and so far the only, edition of Asklepiodotos, published in H. Köchly and W. Rüstow: *Griechische Kriegsschriftsteller*, II, 1, Leipzig, 1855 (henceforth referred to as "K. and R.").

² This is the famous MS of the Greek Tacticians, described best in Bandini: *Catal. Codd. MSS. Graec. Bibl. Laur.*, II, 218-38, and K. K. Müller: *Festschrift für L. Urlichs*, Würzburg, 1880, pp. 105-8. Of this MS Köchly knew only the few words which were quoted by Bandini.

³ See E. Martini: *Catal. di Manoscritti Greci esistenti nelle Biblioteche Ital.* II, 1902, Cat. Cod. Graec. qui in Bibl. Vallicelliana Romae adseruntur, p. 202. This MS was copied by Leo Allatius (1586-1669), Professor of Greek in the Greek Collegium at Rome and later Librarian of the Vatican, direct from the Laurentian at Florence. A small portion of it was printed by Angelo Mai: *Spicilegium Romanum*, vol. IV, Rome, 1840, pp. 578-81. K. and R. are in error when they assert (p. 128) that this MS was in the Vatican. Mai merely reports that he saw it in Rome.

⁴ This MS Köchly collated himself, as he remarks apropos of the Anon. Byzant. (K. and R., II, 2, p. 4) although he says nothing about the matter in the introductory note to Asklepiodotos. That he had done so in time to use his own collations for the edition of Asklepiodotos is not impossible, because it came out in the same year, 1855, as the *Anonymous Byzantinus*. But there is no certainty that he did, and in the notes of his edition of 1855, he manifests no more familiarity with the readings of ABC than he had shown in the *apparatus criticus* which he published along with the first three paragraphs of the first chapter of Asklepiodotos in the *Index Lectionum*, Zürich, 1852, for which he secured his knowledge of the MSS almost certainly from Huntziker (see note 6 below). That Köchly had this MS in time for the edition of Aeneas (1853) is most improbable for he does not speak of this MS [for Aeneas = B] as though he had then seen it, and he refers to it only very rarely in his notes. On the whole it seems nearly certain that for

B = Parisinus 2435, chart., s. XVI, 75a-85b.⁵

C = Parisinus 2528, chart., s. XVII.⁶

D = Parisinus 2447, chart., s. XVI, 1-16.

E = Parisinus Suppl. Grec 83, chart., 1652, 74-91.⁷

F is the archetype of V, A, B and C as is generally recognized.⁷ Although an old and excellent MS it does not give us an impeccable text. Errors of itacism are tolerably frequent, but need no enumeration. The tendency to write prepositional phrases as a single word is marked. Thus, Chapter heading γ'. καθόλην; I, 2 ἀπεναντίας; I, 3 διελεφάντων, etc. Sheer blunders are not so very common. Thus, II, 8 ἐπὶ for ἐπι; *ibid.* 9 οὐξίδημοι for ἔξαριθμοι; III, 2 τὴν δὲ for δὲ τὴν, etc. Evidence that F was copied with fidelity may be seen in numerous instances where the scribe is clearly reproducing merely what he thought he saw, without trying to make either words or sense out of it. The archetype was occasionally lacunose or illegible. It seems not to have been as bad, however, as that of Aeneas in these respects. Indications of lacunae in the original appear very rarely; thus, according to Dr. Rostagno's collation, only in X, 8

all three of these Paris MSS K. and R. had only the collations of Huntziker available when the text of Asklepiodotos was published. Cf. note 6 below.

⁵ Collated for K. and R. probably by Huntziker; see notes 4 and 6.

⁶ Köchly: Index Lect., Zürich, 1852, p. 10, K. and R., p. 129, and II, 2, p. 3 for A, assign all three of the Paris MSS to the 16th century, which is absurd for one written, as C is, by Cl. Salmasius (1588-1653). The dates given above are those of Omont in the Inventaire Sommaire. K. and R. derived their knowledge of C from a collation prepared by Jakob Huntziker. This is not definitely stated, so far as I can find, but is implied by Köchly: Index Lect., Zürich, 1852, pp. 4 and 10 (cf. K. and R., p. 212). Also in K. and R. occasional statements about certain readings of C are given in quotation marks, as though on someone's authority, and twice, X, 16 and XI, 7, Huntziker is named as that authority. In general it might be said of Huntziker's collations that they are not complete enough, and an editor would frequently like more information. It is certainly not safe to infer anything from silence about the reading of any of these MSS.

⁷ The MS was copied at Stockholm by P. D. Huet.

⁸ K. and R., p. 129, had conjectured that such was the case even without having seen F. I owe my knowledge of it to the admirable collation kindly prepared for me by Prof. Dott. Enrico Rostagno of the Laurentian Library at Florence. All my statements about F are, therefore, made upon his high authority.

$\tauὸν ἔμεν$ (space for 3 letters) for $\tauὸν ἔμπροσθεν$, and XII, 11 $\epsilon̄πιδον$ (space for 4 letters) for $\epsilon̄πὶ δόρυ$. Elsewhere the scribe of F seems not to have noticed that anything was missing. How these numerous omissions are to be explained in a text otherwise pretty carefully copied is a question to which I find no answer suggested by the present state of F. Possibly a remote ancestor had been seriously damaged, and the next copyist simply left out what was hard to read. Fortunately the very technical subject-matter enables the editor to make many restorations with complete certainty, while other passages can be recovered by means of the numerous direct or indirect quotations in Aelian, Arrian, and the Military Lexicon (see below, p. 140).

For V we are informed by Mai and Martini that it was copied from the Laurentian MS,⁸ and this is obvious from a mere glance at its readings. We know it only from Mai's publication of chapters I-II, 9 (inclusive). K. and R. used Mai, but as my own collation shows a dozen additional variant readings, their work was none too carefully done. The number of variants from F is large, but not all are due to Allatius; such absurdities as $\tauὴν ἀπολειπόμενον$ (II, 9); $\piρόσωπος$ (II, 5); $\tauολὺ$ (II, 2); $\deltaέχα$ (II, 7), impossible for a native Greek, are certainly typographical errors. Inasmuch as F is still perfectly legible, except in some of the diagrams, which V seems to have omitted anyway,⁹ the only value V can have must lie in the emendations of Allatius, and it is these (disregarding entirely mere errors¹⁰) which we shall examine.

I, 2 $οὐτὲ θώραξι κεκοσμημένον$ F: $κοσμούμενον$ V. A needless and unjustifiable change.

I, 3 $διὰ τὸ συνεπισκέπτεσθαι καὶ τὸν ἵππον$ F: $συνεπισκέπτεσθαι$ V. An obvious and easy change which strangely escaped Salmasius.

⁸ This statement was probably made in the MS itself, for it is given by both Mai and Martini, although neither had any special knowledge of the Laurentian MS.

⁹ Mai makes no mention of them, nor, indeed, of the introductory list of chapters.

¹⁰ These were probably not so numerous as Mai's text would lead one to imagine, for Allatius seems ordinarily to have copied with commendable accuracy, except when he emended. Thus, in the heading of chapter I, V following F has $\phi\alpha\lambdaάγγων$, ABC $\phi\alpha\lambdaάγγος$; so I, 2 $\delta\pi\epsilon\nu\alpha\rho\pi\alpha$ V, $\delta\pi\epsilon\nu\alpha\rho\pi\alpha$ ABC; II, 1 $\lambda\mu\alpha\lambda\eta\tau\alpha$ V, $\lambda\mu\alpha\lambda\eta\tau\alpha$ ABC; II, 3 $\tau\alpha\beta\tau\alpha \tau\epsilon$ V, $\tau\alpha\beta\tau\alpha \tau\epsilon$ ABC, etc.

I, 3 ὁ δὴ τοῖς ἄκροις ἐπικουνωνοῦντες οἱ μὲν τόξοις, οἱ δὲ ἀκοντίοις μάχονται F: οἱ δὲ τοῖς ἄκροις V. An absurd change which destroys the sense of the passage.

I, 3 καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ χρώμενοι σκευῇ (l. ἄλλῃ) F: αὐτῇ V, followed by K. and R. ἄλλῃ is preferable because it means the equipment other than that of bows and javelins just mentioned. Now the heavy cavalry did not use javelins, but long heavy spears (see just above), hence to say that the branch of the intermediate cavalry which resembled the heavy cavalry used the same equipment is incorrect; it was only the rest of the equipment (i. e., apart from the javelins) which was identical with that of the heavy cavalry. The emendation has only a superficial plausibility, but on closer examination turns out to be false.

II, 1 σύμμετρα δέ ἔστι θέμενα τὰ τιθέμενα τὰ μέρη μηδὲν τὴν φάλαγγα πρὸς τὴν μάχην λυμαίνηται (l. λυμαίνεται) F: σ. δ. ἔστι θέμενα τὰ μέρη ἢ μηδὲν κτλ. V. The serious corruption here was in F's archetype. First τά must have dropped out and then ἔστιθέμενα was written by haplography. Next the correction, probably in the form τὰ τιθέμενα ἢ was entered, and both error and correction were copied in F, whose scribe probably completed the confusion by supposing that ἢ belonged before μέρη and so changing it to τά. The one perfectly obvious emendation, the restoration of the relative ἢ after μέρη V did, indeed, make, but even the simple expedient of excluding the meaningless θέμενα seems to have been beyond his powers. The correct emendation of a passage like this was, of course, easy for a scholar like Salmasius.

II, 2 συνωμετία F: συνωμοτία (the accent probably due to Mai or the printer) V. Perfectly obvious emendation, made in all the other MSS as well.

II, 4 towards the end, the words ἡ ἐπιστάται . . . παραστάται are omitted by V. If this was really done by Allatius, not by Mai, or the printer, it is probably due to a belief that these words were a gloss, a view which would have been dispelled by even a very little study of the context.

II, 5 ἀστι F: εἴη V. Unnecessary and no improvement.

II, 7 δι' ὁ F: καί V. The recommendation to select numbers evenly divisible by two down to unity is a direct consequence of the preceding clause, so that the emendation καί is altogether wrong.

II, 8 ἔσονται δή F: δέ V. Unnecessary and less effective.

II, 9 ἐξ ἀριθμοί F: ἐνάριθμοι V. F's reading requires only the simplest change to ἐξάριθμοι. V's emendation makes nonsense.

II, 9 ἡμάφορον . . . τὸν δ' οὐ F: ἡμάφορον . . . ὅτιψ [!] V. What shall we think of the critical ability of a scholar who was unable to emend so obvious an error, particularly when the definition of the term was so broadly hinted at in the very next words, εἰ μὴ φωνῆς κατακούειν ἐνδέχοιτο διὰ θόρυβον?

II, 9 ὅποτε δ' ει μη δ εσημε. δν F: δε μηδὲ σημεῖον V. The correction to *σημεῖον* is too simple to deserve any credit, and nonsense is created by the retention of δέ. An archetype probably had ὅποτε δέ with the correction *μηδέ* for δέ and then F, or its original, ran the two together.

II, 9 τόγε μὴν F: τό γε μὲν V. The correction is obvious, τό γε μὴν. What Allatius could have meant by his changes I have no idea.

With this paragraph Mai's excerpt from V ends, but no more is needed. The character of the thirteen characteristic readings given above, where all but the very simplest corrections are wrong, is sufficient to show that Allatius, whatever his other attainments as a scholar, did not concern himself sufficiently with his task in this instance to deserve anything of Asklepiodotos. It would be a waste of time for any one to collate V in full for any more of his emendations.

A has been copied with great fidelity, but probably not direct from F itself, although it reproduces minutely almost all of its errors (see below under B). It introduces only a small number of changes, which are always wrong,¹¹ except in the most obvious matters.¹² A second hand emends successfully in IV, 1 διαστηκατι of F to διαστημάτων, and two marginal readings (VII, 7 ἵστοις F changed to ὄστοις, and X, 2 υπερασως F changed to υπερκεράστεως) hit the correct word. Otherwise the MS is valueless.

B varies a little more from F than does A and contains a

¹¹ For example, I, 3 τούς τε ἴππους F: τούς δὲ A (also in B and C); III title ἡ κατὰ τὰ μέρη F: κατὰ μέρη A (unnecessary, if not merely a case of haplography); VII, 8 ἐκατέρα F: ἐκατέρα A, where *ἐκάτερα* is required.

¹² For example, II, 2 συνωμετα F: συνωμοτι A (and all the other MSS); II, 10 φιε' F: φιβ' A (obvious to any one who can multiply by two).

comparatively large number of gross blunders. It was not copied from A, as is clear from the way in which it retains a few peculiar errors in F which are not in A. Thus I, 3 F has *περισκέπων* changed to *περισκέπον*, A has *περισκέπον* and B *περισκέπων*; II, 2 F and B (1st hand) have *συνωμετία*, A *συνωμοτία*. On the other hand A and B are obviously very closely related, because both omit the last thirteen words of X, 10, while such senseless errors as II, 7 *ἀρτιακεῖς* A B for *ἀρτιάκις* F; VI, 1 *οὐκ ἔστιν* for *οὐκέτι*; and XI, 2 *πήκται* A *όπηκται* B for *ἐπηγται* F point clearly to a common archetype which must have been a very faithful copy of F, reproducing even both readings in the case of a correction, as in I, 3 mentioned above. B's own changes in no case really emend the text and as a MS B accordingly is worthless. Its marginal readings are, however, interesting and will be taken up in connection with the next MS.

C coming from the pen of Salmasius has, of course, a high value because of its emendations, even though, since the great man was merely copying a MS and not editing a text, he often did not take time to emend all the corruptions, many of which could not in any case have been cured without the aid of the parallel versions in Aelian and Arrian. Mere slips in C have not been recorded, but all the important emendations have, except in those fairly frequent cases where Salmasius' conjecture has been confirmed by the examination of F. C was copied from B (or a descendant of B), because it not only reproduces some of B's peculiar errors like XI, 6 *τετραμερία* for *τετραμερίᾳ*; XII, 11 *μὲν* for *μέντοι*;¹³ but omits regularly what B alone omits, as II, 1 *eis*; IX, 1 *tó*; XI, 7 *δέ*; or else, as in X, 21, where B omits the last five words, C attempts to supply the lacuna, getting correctly only the first two words, which were easy enough to supply.

Salmasius had clearly no MS but B to work upon, for not infrequently his corrections differ a good deal from F. Furthermore he so frequently agrees with a reading in the margin of B that one is tempted to examine into that point somewhat more closely. There are fifteen of these marginal corrections, running from IV, 3 to X, 10, and, what stands almost unpar-

¹³ Errors common to B and C, but not in A are, of course, not very numerous because B resembles A very closely anyway, and then Salmasius emended with the greatest freedom.

alleled in criticism, all but one are certainly right.¹⁴ Besides, they could not have been made from F, because in thirteen of the instances, F itself was corrupt. Now Salmasius followed these very closely; ten out of the fifteen he took over exactly; in three other instances his reading is (by oversight probably) not recorded by K. and R., but the chances are that he accepted the emendation; in one case, VII, 9, he followed the anonymous corrector in B in part but reversed the order of the supplied letters, writing ὅτ instead of τό;¹⁵ and only once, V, 2, did he fail to follow. The credit then for this group of conjectures belongs to the anonymous corrector of B and not to Salmasius, and an editor should accordingly reverse the order of citation from "C B (margin)," as in K. and R., to "B (margin) C."

The brilliant record of success in emendation shows that these marginal readings are the work of no ordinary scholar. They were certainly not made by Salmasius himself, because one he overlooks and another he gets mixed up. Besides, they appear in only a little more than half of the work, while Salmasius copied the whole of it. One thinks at once of Casaubon, who spent ten years at Paris,¹⁶ and was greatly interested in Greek military writers as his *editio princeps* of Aeneas (1609),¹⁷ a closely related author, shows.¹⁸ The restriction of the correc-

¹⁴ I have not counted among these the correction in II, 2 συναρμετία where o is written in the lower margin, because that seems to be of a different kind from the others, and is separated from them by a number of pages.

¹⁵ This seems to constitute a certain proof that the marginal readings of B were used by Salmasius.

¹⁶ To be sure this particular MS was not yet in the Royal Library at the time when Casaubon was at Paris (it belonged to the Hurault Collection which was incorporated in the Royal Library in 1622; see Omont, op. cit., I, p. xix) but a man like Casaubon must have seen numerous libraries and hundreds of MSS during the many years that he spent in France.

¹⁷ Thus Aeneas is contained in Par. 2522, 2435 [= B], and 2443; Asklepiodotos in Par. 2522, 2435 [= B], and 2528. Casaubon also intended at one time to publish Aelian's *Tactica* (preface to Polybius, p. 61), some MSS of which were at Paris, and copied a portion of Leo's *Tactica* (Mark Pattison: Isaac Casaubon, p. 184). Casaubon's emendations of Aeneas are numerous and almost uniformly correct.

¹⁸ To be sure Casaubon used MS 2443 for his text of Aeneas, published in 1609 (see his preface compared with Omont's Catalogue), and

tions to a portion of the MS is just what one might expect of the somewhat desultory habits of Casaubon, as he might have had only a short time in which to examine this MS, and jotted down his ready and sure corrections.

In the case of D photographs of folios 1, 4, and 5 recto and verso (= I, 1—II, 1 and III, 3—VII, 2) were collated as specimens. They are sufficient to determine the relationship and value of the MS so that no more photographs were made. D is descended from F, as is evident from the retention of many of its absurd readings, like I, 3 *χρησίμως ἐρᾶν*, etc. It was not, however, copied direct from F, since it omits in I, 4 the words *ἀσκησιν—παρατάξεως* along with ABC. It derives therefore from a common archetype of these three MSS. By the same token, and because of disagreement in peculiar readings like *κοσμούμενον* in I, 2; *αὐτῷ* I, 3; the omission of *ὡς πολλὴν* I, 3; *καταλοχῆσαι* II, 1, etc., D is not a descendant of V. It was copied with even greater fidelity than were A and B and reproduces not infrequently the exact form of F, as, e. g., I, tit. *φαλάγγων* (*φάλαγγος* ABC); I, 3 *τούς τε* (δέ ABC), etc. It disagrees also so frequently with ABC and B (margin) that it cannot derive directly from any of them, but it is unnecessary to present the complete evidence. Its emendations are:

I, 3 *ἀκοντίζων*: (-σι F). Superfluous.

I, 4 *διαφορὰί ḍ*: δ. αἰδε K. and R. Something is indeed lacking here, and a careful reading of the chapter will show that, as a matter of fact, exactly nine kinds of troops are mentioned, three of infantry, four of cavalry, and one each of chariots and elephants. But a bare number coming after the list is in itself unnatural, and such an enumeration of varieties by number alone is out of keeping with the style of the author. The emendation cannot, therefore, be accepted.

III, 5 *ἀμφοτέρωθεν*: -οθεν F. Obvious.

says nothing about any other MSS of that author, although there is nothing to preclude the possibility of his having known several MSS, even though he used only one. In fact Casaubon had in his own hands, but did not use, a much older MS of Aeneas than the one in the Royal Library which he published (Mark Pattison, op. cit., p. 185). Besides he remained at Paris for a year or more after his Polybius appeared, and might have come to know about this MS at that time.

III, 6 (and VI, 3) *ἐκτακτοι*, the first time with C: *ἐκταροι* F. Obvious.

IV, 3 *κατά* with B (margin): *κα* F. Obvious.

IV, 4 *πήχεις μῆ* with B (margin) and C: *πήχει· μῆ* F. Obvious.

V, tit. *ἱέας*: *εἰδέας* F. Simple.

V, 1 *όκταπάλαιστος*: *όκτοπ-* F. A change is needed, but that to *ω* (K. and R.) is more plausible.

V, 1 *πέμπτον*: *πέμπτον* F. Obvious, but the *τοῦ* supplied by K. and R. is also needed.

V, 1 *πήχεων*: *πηχεων* (sic) F, and *πηχεων* (sic): *πηχαίων* F. Simple changes to the Attic accent and the ordinary spelling.

V, 2 *εἴναι καὶ μὴ τὰς σαρισ* (sic), but in margin *εἰ καὶ μὴ* with B (margin) C K. and R., *τὰς σαρίσσας* with K. and R.: *τὰς σαρίσσας* B (margin) C. Very simple.

VI, 1 *λέγεται* with *Lex. Mil.* § 28 K. and R.: *λέγονται* F. Obvious.

VI, 3 *συστάσεων* with K. and R. Obvious.

VII, 2 *ρομβοειδῆ*: *ρομβοειδεῖ* F. Absurd.

VII, 2 *ἔταρτον* with K. and R.: *ἔλάττων* F. Simple even if not quite obvious.

VII, 2 *ρομβοειδούς . . . σφηνοειδούς . . . ἐμβολοειδούς* (sic) for *-ές* in each case. Absurd.

Two of the changes quoted are clearly wrong, two unnatural, another merely superfluous. The remainder are either obvious or else simple for even an average intelligence. No account has been taken here, of course, of the numerous egregious errors which D leaves uncorrected. An even moderately serious difficulty like that of the "Babylonians" in V, 2 is quite beyond his powers. The three folios examined show no indication of an ability in emendation which would justify a collation of the remainder. Here and there, no doubt, "MS authority" of a certain kind would be given to a correction by Salmasius or by Köchly, but the value of such attestation is extremely slight, and *minima non curat praetor*.

E is carefully written by a competent scholar, P. D. Huet, who, however, was not more than twenty-two years of age at the time. Photographs of folios 75, 78 verso-79 verso (= I, 1-II, 1 and IV, 1-VII, 1) were collated as specimens. E does not derive from any MS of the family ABCD, because, aside from

a large number of disagreements in individual readings, it contains the seven omitted words *ἀσκησιν—παρατάξεως* in I, 4. Its original was either F itself or else a very close copy of it, since in many places it reproduces F's reading much better than ABC. It is not a copy of V for it has none of the latter's peculiar readings, while in I, 3 it contains the omitted words *καὶ πολλήν*. Clear mistakes like V, 2 *τὸν πέμπτον ζυγόν* are relatively rare.

Huet's emendations are:

IV, 1 *ἐξεύρηται* with C: *ἐξηρηται* F. Superfluous.

IV, 2 *ἢ καὶ τὸ βάθος: κατὰ βάθος* F *κατὰ τὸ βάθος* B. Since this change makes no proper sense, it may be merely a slip.

IV, 3 *τὸ δίπτυχν* with B (margin) C. Obvious.

IV, 3 *κατὰ συνασπισμόν* with B (margin) D. Obvious.

IV, 3 *ἐπάγωμεν* with B (margin). Obvious.

V, 1 *οὐδὲ μείζω πλατεῖαν: μει ζολατεσ σαν* (sic) F. A bad mistake.

V, 1 *ῳ δὲ καί: ὠ δὴ καί* F. Certainly wrong, and perhaps only a slip.

V, 1 *πέμπτου* with D. Obvious.

V, 2 In the "Babylonian" passage the only change is to write *τῷ στοίχῳ* with B (margin).

V, 2 *εἶναι* with F against B (margin) C D (margin), *καὶ μὴ ταῖς σαρίσσας* with B (margin) C. The first part of this reading is certainly wrong, and the latter part an unnecessary change. As far as it goes, however, it tends to suggest that Huet *might* have been independent of the marginal emendations in B with which he agrees in every other instance in the folios which we have, thus, IV, 3 thrice; IV, 4; V, 2; VI, 1.

VI, 1 *λέγεται* with *Lex. Mil.* § 28 D. Obvious.

VI, 1 *παρένταξιν* with B (margin) C. Obvious.

VI, 2 *ἡμῖν: ἡμῖν* F (*οὐ μήν* C is correct). Huet saw that there was a difficulty, but the remedy used is trite and shows no understanding of the context.

A majority of the foregoing changes are obvious, one is superfluous, two are bad mistakes, and two other changes may be mere slips. It is clear from such a showing that no emendations beyond the critical insight of a Hermann Köchly are likely to be found in the remainder of this MS, and that a complete collation, accordingly, would not repay the trouble which it would cost.

A new editor of Asklepiodotos, with a knowledge of F's reading, will doubtless be less inclined to introduce emendations than K. and R. who were handling only late MSS. In any event so well have the anonymous corrector, Salmasius, and Köchly done their work, that comparatively little remains to be gleaned. A few passages, however, may perhaps be discussed here not without profit, in view of the age and excellent character of F.

I, 2 it is said that the light-armed troops use "javelins, slings, καὶ ὄλως τοῖς ἐξ ἀποστήματος λεγομένοις τοξεύμασιν. τόξευμα as a general term for "missile" is apparently not otherwise attested, but it seems better to retain it here than with K. and R. to delete it and insert ὅπλοις after ὄλως. In a similar way φάλαγξ (I, title, and § 4; cf. Anon. Byzant., XV, 1) is used generically of any kind of military detachment.¹⁹

I, 3 καὶ τὸ μὲν ἐγγύθεν ὄμοίως βαρυτάτη κέχρηται σκευῆ, τούς τε (δὲ A B C μὲν K. and R.) ἵππους καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας πανταχόθεν θώραξι περισκέπον, μακροῖς † μὲν (δὲ K. and R.) χρόμενον καὶ αὐτὸς τοῖς δόρασιν, † δὲ καὶ δορατοφόρον τοῦτο καὶ ξυστοφόρον προσαγορεύεται κτλ. F. Here μέν is certainly corrupt, and a little further on δὲ and τοῦτο surely cannot stand side by side. Everything runs smoothly, however, if we keep τε with F, and read μέντοι and δι' ὁ (cf. II, 7; δι' ἂ, II, 9) below.

I, 3 ἀλλῃ (actually ἀλλη) F as against αὐτῇ Allatius and K. and R. has been discussed above.

II, 2 συνωμοτία (συνωμετία F corrected by A B [lower margin] C V) is to be retained, although not elsewhere attested, partly because it is designated here as an obsolete expression, and partly because of its proper formation and of the large list of closely related words.

II, 2 ὡνόμαστο K. and R. is a needless change from ὡνόμασται; and similarly in 4 δὰ τὸ παραλλήλους ἴστασθαι need not be changed to παρ' ἀλλήλοις (K. and R.) in an author as late as ours (despite ἀνὰ λόγον in III, 1; see below).

II, 9 σημειοφόρον (ἡμάφορον F) is out of its proper order. Inasmuch as Asklepiodotus is extremely exact in such matters,

¹⁹ That seems more natural than to suppose that this is a survival of the loose Homeric usage.

and the word as well as its explanation below in any event are corrupt,²⁰ it seems not improper to restore the correct order.

III, 1 *γεωμέτριοι* F: *γεώμετροι* K. and R. As neither word is attested elsewhere, F's reading may be preserved with some hesitation, though if one emended, *γεωμετρικοί* would involve less change than *γεωμέτραι*.

III, 1 *ἔαν τέσσαρα ἀνάλογον* (*ἀνάλογα* Salmasius, K. and R.) *ἢ* F. Here *τὰ* seems necessary, because a particular group of just four numbers is mentioned. Also *ἀνὰ λόγον* which F's reading presupposes should be retained.

III, 6 *ἐν τοῖς συνασπισμοῖς συνεδρεύειν ἀναγκάζοειν* F. K. and R. suggest *συνερέδειν* from Polybius, XII, 21, 3 which would be excellent. The well attested use of *συνεδρεύειν* in the sense "accompany," "be closely connected," may, however, justify the retention of F's reading here.

IV, 2 *ἢ κατὰ βάθος, τε καὶ στοῖχον* (*l. στοιχεῖν*) F. For *τε*, which is impossible, K. and R. suggest *ὅπερ*. Somewhat closer would be *τὸ καὶ* in the same sense, used as the common *ὁ καὶ* in papyri and inscriptions for alternative designations.

IV, 2 *ὅπερ ὄνομάζεται καὶ παραστάτην ἐπιστάτην* F. Salmasius emended to *κατὰ παραστάτην καὶ ἐπιστάτην*. In view of the fact, however, that the other terms just given are verb forms, perhaps we should read *καὶ παραστατεῖν καὶ ἐπιστατεῖν*.

VII, 1 *τόπος ἀμείνους προκαταλαβεῖν καὶ τὸς προκατελημένους ἀναλαβεῖν*. K. and R. change the last word to *ἀναστεῖλαι*, taking the preceding participle as middle. But it must be passive, a use which is well attested, and to change is clearly wrong.

VII, 2 *πρός τε τὰς ἀπορίας καὶ τὰς ἐπιστροφὰς τῶν ἵππων* F. For the impossible *ἀπορίας* K. and R. read *ἀναστροφάς*, a word which appears in paragraph 3 below. But here it seems to mean "wheeling round" in general, while *ἐπιστροφή* means "wheeling to face the enemy," and *ἀποστροφή* (which is closer also to F's reading), meaning "wheeling away from the enemy," is clearly the word needed here.

VII, 3 *τὸ γὰρ μέτωπον τῶν ἐμβόλων βραχὺ γινόμενον* F. For

²⁰This corruption of both term and explanation although separated by several lines, suggests that both were in the margin of some ancestor MS and so especially subject to injury. If that be the case there need be no hesitation about shifting the present order slightly.

βραχὺ K. and R. read *σφόδρα ὁξὺ*, which is in a measure supported by the parallel passage in Arrian, XVIII, 4 τὸ μέτωπον ἐς ὁξὺ ἀπολῆγον. But *βραχύ* is logical and strictly speaking more exact than *ὁξύ*, while Aelian, in the parallel passage, who is clearly following Asklepiodotos very much more closely than Arrian, reads τὸ δὲ μέτωπον *βραχύ τι γενόμενον*. There is, therefore, no occasion to emend.

VII, 4 in speaking of cavalry formations a depth of *τριῶν η̄ τεττάρων ιπποτῶν* is mentioned. K. and R. emend to *ιππῶν*, but needlessly, since Asklepiodotos at the beginning of the paragraph speaks of depth of *όκτὼ . . . ἄνδρας*, and in treating schematic cavalry formations one can as readily say "men" as "horses."

X, 1. K. and R. bracket some seven terms in this paragraph, because there is no definition of them in what follows, suggesting that they may be interpolations from Aelian. This last is surely a counsel of desperation, for there is not the least suspicion that such an unlikely thing has happened anywhere else. As for *στοιχεῖν* and *ζυγεῖν*, these terms were defined in II, 6 and, though they are introduced here no doubt for the sake of completeness, it is superfluous to redefine them. Similarly in the case of *παρεμβολή* and the four other terms bracketed by K. and R. at the end of the paragraph, it is much better in view of the large number of undoubted lacunae in Asklepiodotos, to assume a lacuna in § 21, rather than delete these important technical terms. Besides, the first four of these terms are defined in VI, 1 and the fifth, *ἐπίτραξις*, is perfectly clear from the definition of *ἐπίτραγμα* in VII, 10, so that it is possible that here also, as in the case of *στοιχεῖν* and *ζυγεῖν*, Asklepiodotos may have intentionally omitted redefinitions.

X, 9, XII, 1 and 6 K. and R. needlessly change *ἀποκαθιστάνειν* of F (used by Polybius and Diodorus) to *ἀποκαθιστάναι*.

X, 11 εἰ . . . ποιοίμεθα τὴν ἐπιστροφήν, τόπον ἐφέξει, κτλ. F. K. and R. read *ποιούμεθα*, but the mixed condition is paralleled by X, 12, εἰ . . . κελεύοιντο . . . δέησει, which K. and R. allow to stand, and further supported by XII, 4 εἰ . . . βουλοίμεθα . . . παραγγελοῦμεν, where K. and R. needlessly change to *βουλόμεθα*.

X, 13 τὸ δὲ ἔστιν F. τόδε is clearly required, since only a single manoeuvre is described, not τάδε as K. and R. print.

X, 16. For *ισχυρὰ ποιεῖται* of F, Salmasius (followed by K. and R.) conjectures *ισχυροποιεῖται*, a needless change.

XI, 2 . . . οὐ μόνον ἐπὶ τῆς ὅλης φάλαγγος ἐκδέχεσθαι δεῖ (χρή K. and R. after Salmasius, needlessly) ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν μερῶν F. K. and R. delete γάρ. To be sure I find no other example of ἀλλὰ γὰρ καί, but the combination in the natural sense of "but indeed also" is appropriate here, while ἀλλὰ γὰρ δῆ is not uncommon, and Plato once uses ἀλλὰ γὰρ ὅμως (Rep., 432 C).

XII, 6 δύο ἐπιστροφὰς ἐπὶ τοινῦ (l. τὸ αὐτὸ) δόρυ ποιῆσαι παραγγελοῦμεν F. K. and R. in order to keep δόρυ supply τοντέστιν (an expression not found in Asklepiodotos) ἐπί. But the phrase is not in Aelian's excerpt (Tactica, XXXII, 6 δύο ποιήσομεν τοῦ συντάγματος ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐπιστροφάς), and is utterly otiose, so that δόρυ is much more likely to be an intruded gloss upon τὸ αὐτό.

XII, 10 προσήθισται was changed by K. and R. to προσείθισται. But Cod. S of Demosthenes gives forms of the perfect in ἥθ- (XXVI, 18; XXVII, 64; LXI, 14), and it is attested likewise by an inscription from Syros of 166-9 A. D. ταῖς ἥθισμέναις ἥμέραις (I. G. XII, 5, 662, 14), so that it seems best to retain the form, although unusual, here.

Since technical military terminology, especially for the Hellenistic period, has been somewhat inadequately treated in the lexicons, and since Asklepiodotos is the earliest authority to use many of these terms, for Suidas merely plundered the compiler of the *Military Lexicon*²¹ who drew largely from Aelian²² and

²¹ Best edited in K. and R., vol. II, 2, pp. 217 ff.; also in Bernhardy's ed. of Suidas, II, 2, pp. 1735 ff. This work was clearly put under considerable contribution by Stephanus in the first edition of the Thesaurus, but he gave no page or paragraph references, and by using several different appellations for it, *De re militari*; *De vocab. mil.*; *De vocab. castrensis*, he seems to have confused the later editors, who generally leave such references untouched. When they have occasion to use the same work, they generally call it *Lex. ap. Montef. Bibl. Coislin.*, after Montfaucon's reproduction of the Coislin. MS. It would appear that they did not notice that this was identical with the work referred to by Stephanus, and neither they nor Stephanus made very systematic use of it.

²² References to Aelian's and Arrian's Tactics (given generally "Aelian-Arrian") are taken from the ed. of K. and R., II, 1, 1855.

Arrian (but also in part from Asklepiodotos), while these latter were dependent in part upon Asklepiodotos, it may not be amiss to record here the principal additions to the standard lexicons which Asklepiodotos affords. In the following list I shall give not merely what appear to be new words (marked with an *) but also special meanings of words and a few phrases which are either not recorded, or for which the evidence quoted comes from a much later period. In a few instances inexact definitions are corrected. References to the other Tacticians and to ancient lexicons are given only where false definitions are corrected. The lexicons used are the revised Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (1831-65), Liddell and Scott (8th edition), Van Herwerden, Lexicon Suppletorium et Dialecticum, 2nd ed., 1910.²³ When a term in the lexicons is adequately defined from Aelian, I have not thought it necessary to cite it here. When, however, only late authorities are adduced, it has seemed proper to point out the much earlier source.

ἄκρον, τό, the wing of a line of battle (= κέρας), I, 3.

**ἀντιπορία, ἡ, a counter-attack, or frontal attack, X, 2.*

ἀντίστομος, -ον; πορεία ἀντίστομος, marching in two parallel columns, the lines of the front-rank-men on the inside, XI,

3. L. and S., following the Thesaurus, regard this word which they know only from Arrian XXXVII, 7, as probably a false reading for *ἀμφίστομος*. But the two are totally different, as a comparison with Aelian, XXXIII, 3 (a passage which had fallen out in Arrian!) and Asklepiodotos, l. c., shows.

ἀποκατάστασις, ἡ, return to original position, after wheeling or other evolutions, X, 1; 9; 11. Cf. ἐπικατάστασις.

ἀποτομή, ἡ, ἀποτομὴ κέρατος, a half-wing, or corps, 4096 men in the typical phalanx, II, 10; III, 1 and 2.

**ἀραρός, τό, (neu. perf. ptc. of ἀρασίσκω used as subst.), joining-point, point of division between the two wings of an army (cf. διχοτομία and ὄμφαλός), II, 6. The word occurs also*

²³ W. Crönert's admirable revision of Passow in so far as it has reached our library extends only to the word *ἀνά*. It seems not to contain, however, *ἄκρον* as a technical term for "wing," *κέρας*, although use is made in it for the first time systematically of our author, e. g. s. v. *ἄκροβολιστής*, *ἀμφίστομος*, etc.

in Arrian-Aelian, VII, 3 (corrupted into ὅπαρος in the Mil. Lex., § 23, and ἄπαρος in Suidas, s. v. διχοτομία).

*γεωμέτριος, ὁ, a geometrician, III, 1 (if the reading of F be followed; v. supra, p. 138).

*διπέπενσις, ἡ, a break-through with cavalry, VII, 3.

διφαλαγγία, ἡ, a double-corps, one-half of a phalanx, or 8192 men in the typical phalanx, II, 10. The term "double-phalanx" used by L. and S. is certainly misleading. To draw up an army in διφαλαγγία formation is to divide the phalanx in two, placing one half behind the other, as is clear from Polybius, II, 66, 9; XII, 20, 7. See also Aelian-Arrian, IX, 9 and the Mil. Lex., §§ 18 and 19.

διχοτομία, ἡ, joining-point, point of division between the two wings of an army (cf. ἀπαρός and ὁμφαλός), II, 6. The same meaning is given also by Aelian, VII, 3 and the Mil. Lex. § 23, along with the ordinary sense of διχοτομία, as a division into two equal parts, but Arrian, VII, 3 expresses it ἵνα δέ που ἡ διχοτομία γίνεται . . . ὁμφαλὸς ὀνομάζεται κτλ.

ἐκτάκτος, -ον; οἱ ἐκτάκτοι, supernumeraries, attached originally to the τάξις, but later either to the σύνταγμα, II, 9, or the ἐκατονταρχία of light-armed troops, VI, 3, or else the phalanx of light-armed troops, VI, 3. The Thesaurus in an incomplete statement quotes only Aelian and the Mil. Lex.

ἐμπλέκω, ἐμπλεκόμενοι, incorporate, used of light-armed troops incorporated with the hoplites, man beside man, VI, 1.

ἐναντίος, -α, -ον; ἀπ' ἐναντίας, on the contrary or other hand, I, 2. Van Herwerden gives several examples from Procopios.

ἐνωμοτία, ἡ, a quarter of a file (λόχος), II, 2. For this same use of the word in Hellenistic tactics, see Aelian-Arrian, V, 2, and the Mil. Lex. § 4, and compare K. and R., II, 2, pp. 243 f.

ἐξάριθμος, -ον, outside the normal number, in addition to it, supernumerary, II, 9. The Thesaurus quotes only the Mil. Lex.

ἐξελίσσω, countermarch, X, 1; XII, 11. The lexicons give only the meaning deploy, although L. and S. give countermarching as one of the meanings of ἐξελιγμός. The sense

countermarch is amply attested by Aelian-Arrian, XXVII, 1-5, and the Mil. Lex., § 39.

ἐπιθηραρχία, *η*, *a unit of four war-elephants*, IX, 1.

ἐπικαθίστημι, *to advance to original position*, X, 11. Cf. *ἐπικατάστασις*.

**ἐπικατάστασις*, *η*, *advance to original position*, after wheeling, X, 1 and 9. Cf. *ἀποκατάστασις*.

ἐπικοινωνέω, *to be attached to, or stationed upon*, I, 3.

ἐπιξεναγός, *ὁ*, *commander of an ἐπιξεναγία*, i. e. 2048 *ψιλοί*, VI, 3.

The Thesaurus refers only to the Mil. Lex.

ἐπίταγμα, *τό*, *supporting force*, especially the phalanx of *ψιλοί*, 8192 men, VI, 3; VII, 10.

ἐπίταξις, *η*, *supporting position*, X, 1 (cf. VII, 10).

ἐπιφάνεια, *η*, *facing*, to the right or to the left, X, 4.

**ἐπεροστόμως*, *adv.* of *ἐπερόστομος*, used of the march of an army in column when the front-rank-men are on different sides of the two wings, XI, 4.

ζυγαρχία, *η*, *a military unit of two war-chariots*, VIII, 1. L. and S. quote Asklepiodotos, indeed, but suggest the wrong definition, as of the command of a captain of cavalry. The Thesaurus fails to give the passage in Aelian. It is XXII, 2.

ζώρχος, *ὁ*, *the commander of one war-elephant*, IX, 1. L. and S. take the word in Aelian, XXIII, 1 incorrectly as an adjective.

**ἡμισιάλω*, *to halve*, *τὸ βάθος ἡμισιάλε*, XII, 11.

θηραρχία, *η*, *a unit of two war-elephants*, IX, 1.

θηραρχος, *ὁ*, *a commander of two war-elephants*, IX, 1.

ιλάρχης, *ὁ*, *a commander of eight war-elephants*, IX, 1. The Thesaurus gives the correct meaning, but quotes no authority. Add Aelian, XXIII, 1 (*εἰλάρχης*).

ταπαρχία, *η*, *two Ταπαρτωρχίαι of cavalry*, VII, 11. The Thesaurus gives the correct meaning but quotes no authority. Add Aelian, XX, 2, and the Mil. Lex., § 32.

ισοσθενέω, *be equally strong*, *ισοσθενεῖν*, III, 4; *ισοσθενήσουσι*, III, 2. The Thesaurus and L. and S. quote only Galen and Cyril of Alexandria.

κεράρχης, *ὁ*, *the commander of a κέρας*, or wing, composed of 8192 men, II, 10; or, especially, *the commander of 32 war-*

elephants, IX, 1. The Thesaurus quotes only the Mil. Lex.

κέρας, τό, a squadron of 32 war-chariots, VIII, 1.
κοιλέμβολος, ὁ, hollow wedge, XI, 5. L. and S. and the Thesaurus give only *κοιλέμβολον* from Suidas.

λοξός, -ή, -όν; λοξὴ φάλαγξ, a phalanx in march with extended front, one wing in advance of the other, X, 1; XI, 1.

λοχαγός, ὁ, the front man and leader of a file (λόχος), II, 2.

μεταγωγή, ḡ, wheeling, manoeuvering, VII, 5.

μῆκος, τό, the first line of a phalanx, II, 5.

ξεναγία, ḡ, two battalions of ψλοί, a regiment of 512 men, VI, 3
 [supplied from Aelian, XVI, 3].

**όκταλοχία, ḡ, a unit of eight λόχοι*, II, 9.

**όκτωπάλαιστος, -ον, of eight palms*, approximately 24 inches, V, 1.

**όμοιοστόμως*, adverb of *όμοιόστομος*, used of marching in parallel columns, or also in sequence, the line of front-rank-men on the same side of each division, XI, 3; XI, 4.

όρθός, -ή, -όν, εἰς ὄρθὸν ἀποδοῦναι, to face the front originally held, lines front, X, 1.

οὐρά, ḡ; ἐπ' οὐράν, about-face to the rear from the enemy; ἀπ' οὐρᾶς, about-face from the rear toward the enemy, X, 3.
 The Thesaurus quotes only the Mil. Lex.

οὐραγός, ὁ, the last man in file (λόχος), II, 2; III, 6, etc., the man at the rear angle of a squadron, VII, 2; a supernumerary to the *τάξις*, II, 9; or to the *ἐκατονταρχία*, VI, 3.

δηματικός, -ή, -όν, pertaining to the mounted force of an army, whether cavalry, chariots, or elephants, I, 1 and 3. L. and S. (following the Thesaurus) quote only a gloss in the sense "of or for a vehicle."

παραγωγή, ḡ, march-in line, where the phalanx on the march keeps its original battle-line, whether marching with extended front or in column, X, 1; XI, 1 ff. L. and S. give only "a wheeling from column into line," but the usage of Asklepiodotos is attested by Aelian-Arrian, XXVI, 3 and the Mil. Lex., § 48.

παράταξις, ḡ, the first line of a phalanx, II, 5.

πεντηκονταρχία, ḡ, two squads of ψλοί, a platoon, consisting of 64 men. VI, 3. The Thesaurus quotes only the Mil. Lex. Add Aelian-Arrian, XVI, 1.

πλάγιος, -α, -ον; *πλαγία φάλαγξ*, an army in march with the front extended, X, 1; XI, 1.

πρόπτωσις, ḡ, *projection of spears* in front of a phalanx, V, 1.

**προσέντραξις*, ḡ, *flank position*, used of light infantry stationed on the wings of the phalanx, VI, 1.

πρόταξις, ḡ, *van position of ψιλοί*, VI, 1. The Thesaurus quotes only Suidas and the Mil. Lex. Compare *προτασσόμενοι*, Aelian, XV, 1.

σημειοφόρος, ὁ, *signalman*, II, 9; VI, 3. L. and S. (following the Thesaurus) give only the meaning "standardbearer." The Mil. Lex. § 14 (here clearly following Asklepiodotos) gives both term and definition, while Aelian, IX, 4 contains merely the term without definition.

Σκύθης, ὁ, *archer-cavalry*, I, 3.

στῖφος, τό, *two divisions of ψιλοί, a corps*, of 4096 men, VI, 3.

στρατηγός, ὁ, *a general*, formerly of a corps of 4096 men, but properly of a full phalanx, II, 10.

σύζευξις, ḡ; *κατὰ σύζευξιν*, used of an army marching in parallel columns, XI, 2.

συλλοχισμός, ὁ, *drawing up by files*, an arrangement of the phalanx with files parallel, II, 5. The Thesaurus quotes only the Mil. Lex. (= § 7). Add Aelian VI, 1.

συνεδρεύω, *close up, draw together*, of troops taking up the compact formation, III, 6 (cf. above, p. 138).

συνεπισκέπτω, *συνεπισκέπτεσθαι*, *protect at the same time*, of a shield for man and horse, I, 3.

σύνταγμα, *a double τάξις*, or *a battalion*, composed of 16 files, II, 8; III, 6; = *συνταξιαρχία*, II, 10.

**συνταξιαρχία*, ḡ, *a battalion*, II, 9; takes the place of *σύνταγμα*, II, 10; III, 3 and 4.

**συνωμότια*, ḡ, *a band of sworn soldiers*, early designation of a file, II, 2 (cf. above, p. 137).

σύντασις, ḡ, *four files of ψιλοί, a squad*, consisting of 32 men, VI, 3.

ταξιαρχία, ḡ, *a command of eight files of infantry*, = *τάξις*, II, 10; III, 4.

ταξιαρχός, ὁ, *commander of a τάξις or ταξιαρχία*, II, 8.

τάξις, ḡ, *a company*, the same as *ταξιαρχία*, eight files of infantry, II, 8 and 9.

Ταραντῖνοι, *οἱ*, cavalry who fight only with javelins at a distance, I, 3. Listed and correctly defined only in Pape-Benseler: Wörterb. d. griech. Eigennamen.

τέλος, *τό*, a division of infantry, the same as *μεραρχία*, of 2048 men, II, 10; in cavalry, a half phalanx, VII, 11.

τόξευμα, *τό*, a missile of any kind, I, 2 (cf. above, p. 137).

τοξότης, *ὁ*, archer-cavalry, a special branch, the same as *Σκύθης*, I, 3.

ὑπερβάλλω; *τὸ κέρας ὑπερβαλέσθαι*, to outflank on one wing only, opposed to *ὑπερφαλαγγέω*, outflank on both wings, X, 2 and 18.

ὑποβαίνω, follow, as one rank at a certain interval behind another, V, 1.

ὑποστολή, *ἡ*; *δι' ὑποστολῆς*, holding back, X, 21.

ὑπόταξις, *ἡ*, a rear-position, used of light infantry stationed behind the phalanx, VI, 1.

φαλαγγάρχης, *ὁ*, commander of a *φαλαγγαρχία*, or corps, 4096 men, II, 10; commander of the phalanx of war-elephants, 64 in number, IX, 1.

φαλαγγαρχία, *ἡ*, a corps, 4096 men, II, 10. L. and S. suggest that the word is equivalent to *phalanx*, and quote only Suidas and the Byzantines. But the meaning as given above appears also in Aelian-Arrian, IX, 8, and in the Mil. Lex., § 17.

φάλαγξ, *ἡ*, any branch of the army, chapter heading I; I, 4; the force of hoplites, 16,384 men, II, 10, etc.; the full force of 64 war-chariots, VIII, 1.

W. A. OLDFATHER.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

IV.—THE LATIN TEXT OF THE PARIS PSALTER: A COLLATION AND SOME CONCLUSIONS.

The Latin text of the famous "Paris Psalter" (Ms. 8824, fonds latin, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris) has not been reprinted since the *editio princeps* by Thorpe¹ in 1835, altho both the "West-Saxon Psalms,"² the accompanying translation of the first "fifty," and the "Anglian Psalms,"³ the metrical version of pss. li-cl, have had modern editions. Meanwhile a number of students of these important Old English documents have used Thorpe's Latin text, with a pathetic reliance upon its fidelity and accuracy, for the determination of the exact relation of the versions juxtaposed in the Paris Psalter and their place in the succession of medieval Latin and Anglo-Saxon psalters; and far-reaching inferences have been drawn in recent years. In order to show the true character of Thorpe's text, a collation of the first fifty psalms with the original manuscript is hereby presented, together with an outline of alterations which seem to be indicated in certain over-hasty earlier conclusions.

A suspicion might well have been awakened by the fact that Thorpe does not vouch for the accuracy of the Latin portion of his work, as he does for the Anglo-Saxon. Of the latter he says in his "Praefatio" (p. vii): "Errores quos apertum est ex incuria librarii provenisse corrigere non dubitavi, omnes locos ad finem voluminis notans quibus emendandis operam navavi." This promise is fairly well fulfilled, considering the date of the edition, altho a glance at the textual notes of the latest editors will show that frequently, tho doubtless unintentionally, Thorpe has failed to reproduce the manuscript text of the West-Saxon

¹ *Libri Psalmorum Versio Antiqua; cum Paraphrasi Anglo-Saxonica, partim soluta oratione, partim metrice composita. Nunc primum . . . descriptis et edidit Benjamin Thorpe. Oxonii, MDCCCXXXV.*

² *Liber Psalmorum: The West-Saxon Psalms, being the Prose Portion, or the "First Fifty," of the so-called Paris Psalter, J. W. Bright and R. L. Ramsay. Advanced Edition, 1907. (The Complete Edition, with Introduction and appended matter, will shortly be issued.)*

³ *Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Poesie, C. W. M. Grein and R. P. Wülker. III. Band, 2. Hälfte, 1898.*

and Anglian Psalms. But with regard to the adjoining Latin he merely remarks (p. vi): "Versio Latina nullam mihi cognitam omnino refert, sed ad 'Versionem Antiquam Romanam' proxime accedit," adding in a footnote, "Ex hac versione lacunas textus Latini explevi." This last statement refers to the numerous lost pages for which Thorpe has supplied the missing Latin. His additions are inserted without indicating where they begin and end, and they are, as a matter of fact, far from being accurate transcripts of the Roman version; apparently they are merely copied in from the Vulgate, with occasional Roman readings. Nor did he hesitate, where the manuscript text lay before him, to make an extraordinary number of seemingly arbitrary changes.

In the collation made by Tanger⁴ in 1883, a considerable proportion, tho by no means all, of these changes were revealed. Tanger's useful article should have served as a warning to future investigators of the danger of implicit confidence in Thorpe's text; yet strange to say practically all of them have disregarded his warning and his list of variant readings alike.

The most serious offender is the latest to publish a study of the Anglo-Saxon psalters and their inter-relations. In his able and otherwise scholarly article,⁵ Wildhagen places the Latin text of the Paris Psalter latest in the succession of the English copies of the "Psalterium Romanum" furnish'd with vernacular renderings, on the ground of its containing the largest number of Gallican readings. Wildhagen's theory postulates a peculiar national text of the Latin Psalter going back in all probability to a single copy brought by the earliest Roman missionaries. This primitive Anglican text followed the Roman version in the main, but contained a very considerable number of distinctive variants,—partly readings carried in from pre-Hieronymian versions, partly certain Gallican readings that were presumably

⁴ Gustav Tanger, "Collation des Pariser Altenglischen Psalters mit Thorpe's Ausgabe," *Anglia* VI (1883), *Anzeiger*, 125-141.

⁵ Karl Wildhagen, *Studien zum Psalterium Romanum in England und zu seinen Glossierungen (in geschichtlicher Entwicklung)*, Studien zur englischen Philologie, L, 417-472, 1913. See also Wildhagen's earlier publications: *Der Psalter des Eadwine von Canterbury*, Stud. z. eng. Phil., XII, 1905; *Archiv f. neuere Sprachen*, CXVI, 159-163, 1906; *Deutsche Literatur-Zeitung*, 1909, 3106 f.; *Der Cambridger Psalter: I. Text mit Erklärungen*, Grein-Wülker, Bibl. d. angels. Prosa, VII, 1910.

found in the original English copy,⁶ and partly readings that are found only in the English manuscripts. Wildhagen attempts to determine this Anglican text in large part by a comparison of the nine Anglo-Saxon Psalters of the type that survive: namely, those known as the Salaberga, Blickling, Vespasian, Junius, Royal, Eadwine's, Bosworth, Cambridge, and Paris Psalters, which he ranges approximately in this order of time, from the end of the seventh to the beginning of the eleventh century.⁷ The succession is marked by a gradual replacement of what Wildhagen considers the primitive Anglican readings by the ordinary Roman text, and by the introduction of new readings, mainly Gallican. At the end of this process Wildhagen places the Latin text of the Paris Psalter, when the Roman text was being superseded altogether by the Gallican under the influence of the Benedictine Reform and the rising Norman influence; and accordingly it belongs in order of development just between the two traditions, Roman and Gallican, the latter being represented in England by the Spelman (or Stowe), Vitellius, Tiberius, Lambeth, Arundel, and Salisbury

⁶ With regard to these Gallican variants found from the beginning in the English psalters of the Roman type, Wildhagen seems to have changed his opinion. In his study of Eadwine's Psalter (p. 213) he maintained that they are only apparently Gallican,—that each instance really goes back to one of the Old Latin or pre-Hieronymian versions, or else to a patristic rendering that was carried into the original English copy, any coincidence with the Gallican being purely accidental. The same explanation is strenuously defended in his review of Roeder's edition of the Royal Psalter (*Archiv f. n. Spr.* CXVI, 159 f.). But in the *Studien zum Psalterium Romanum* (p. 421), he admits the possibility of early direct influence from the Gallican version,—“vielleicht hier und da in Anlehnung an Hieronymus' Bearbeitung des Psalterium Gallicanum—die von Gallien aus eingeführt bis zum 6. Jahrhundert in England verbreitet gewesen war.” Here lies the weakest point in his whole theory; for if there were numerous Gallican readings already present in the Anglican archetype, manifestly it becomes impossible to say whether a Gallican reading found only in two or three, or even in one, of the surviving psalters, is a part of the primitive stock that has been regularized out of the others, or an instance of the rising tide of later Gallican influence.

⁷ *Eadwine's Psalter* is, of course, in its present form a product of the early twelfth century; but Wildhagen holds that its Latin text was fixt about 950, approximately about the same time as the Royal, and a little earlier than the Cambridge Psalter.

Psalters.⁸ Wildhagen's order, while of course not wholly, is largely derived from a detailed comparison of readings; and this is especially the case with his conclusions about the Paris Psalter. As an important corollary, he holds that the prose West-Saxon Psalms and the Latin text were copied into the Paris Psalter from the same manuscript, both alike having been produced at Malmesbury, whereas the Anglian Psalms were taken from another manuscript brought to Malmesbury from Mercian territory, probably from Worcester.⁹

But when we discover, as the present collation will show, and as Wildhagen might have learned in large part from Tanger, that the extensive concessions to Ga supposedly found in P are non-existent, an important part of the foundation for his theory disappears. For example, Wildhagen illustrates the supposed character of the P text by citing (p. 466) the following Ga readings from Thorpe's edition:

ix. 23, quaeret (inquiret Ro); xi. 7, argentum igne examinatum probatum (Ro om. probatum) terrae; xii. 5, in misericordia tua speravi (in tua misericordia sperabo Ro); xvi. 12, eripe animam meam ab impio frameam tuam ab inimicis manus tuae (. . . frameam inimicorum de manu tua Ro); xvi. 13, a paucis de terra divide eos in vita eorum (a paucis a terra dispertire eos et supplanta eos in vita ipsorum Ro); xxiv. 18, non erubescam (domine non confundar Ro); lvii. 4, et venifici incantantis sapienter (et beneficia quae incantantur a sapiente Ro); xciv. 9, dicit in gentibus quia (Ro om. quia) dominus regnavit.

But of the eight supposed Ga readings only one¹⁰ is actually found in the Paris manuscript! Thorpe alone is responsible for the other departures cited; and furthermore, except for one

⁸The usual abbreviations are used in this article: A = Vespasian, B = Junius, C = Cambridge, D = Royal, E = Eadwine's, D¹ = Blickling, L = Bosworth, P = Paris; F = Spelman, G = Vitellius, H = Tiberius, I = Lambeth, J = Arundel, K = Salisbury; Ro = Roman Version, Ga = Gallican Version.

⁹*Studien zum Psalterium Romanum*, pp. 469 f.

¹⁰At xi. 7 the manuscript does have the word probatum omitted in Ro. In the other seven passages it is faithful to Ro, with some variations found also in the other Psalters: thus at xxiv. 18 P reads non confundar, omitting domine, as do also A and B; and at lvii. 4, according to Tanger, P reads et uenifici que incantantur a sapiente, with A, B, C, D, and E.

minor change of order, the correct reading had already been supplied by Tanger. On another page (p. 469, note 4), Wildhagen affirms that frequently P gives a mixed reading, blending Ro and Ga. The passages he cites as examples are ix. 24, xi. 3, xxvi. 5, xxx. 4, xlvi. 2. In every case the apparent mixture is the work of Thorpe; and again Thorpe's changes had already been corrected by Tanger.

Wildhagen does not profess to have given a complete list of the Ga readings he has found in P. He reserves a complete treatment (p. 469) for the second volume, which has not appeared, of his edition of the Cambridge Psalter. But in the first volume, "Text mit Erklärungen," published in 1910, he has very frequently cited the Latin text of P, with equally unfortunate results. His references, which are all taken from Thorpe, are wrong in the following instances,¹¹ as may be seen by comparing them with the corrections made below:

ii. 13; vii. 15; viii. 8; ix. 7, 13, 24, 25, 31; xiii. 6; xvi. 1; xvii. 5, 13, 33, 45; xviii. 9; xxi. 21; xxv. 7, 8, 9; xxviii. 9; xxix. 13; xxxi. 4; xxxiii. 15; xxxiv. 7; xxxvi. 21, 25, 36; xxxvii. 7, 14, 16, 20; xxxviii. 7; xxxix. 5; xl. 2, 3, 7; xlv. 3; xlvi. 8, 15, 16; xl ix. 4, 9, 21, 23; l. 9. For the second and third fifties the following should be compared with Tanger: lvi. 10; lvii. 6; lxvii. 8, 22; lxviii. 36, 37; lxix. 4; lxxi. 6; lxxxv. 17; lxxxix. 9; ciii. 2, 11, 19; cxvii. 8; cxviii. 171; cxxxii. 11; cxlvii. 18. Most of these are cases where, instead of having a Ga reading, as Wildhagen had gathered from Thorpe, P really agrees with Ro or with one or more of the other English copies of Ro. We even find Wildhagen gravely citing as P the substitutes which Thorpe provided, as he explains in the passage from the Praefatio quoted above, for the pages cut out of the manuscript (e. g., at xx. 7, 9, 13; xxxviii. 2; l. 16, 18; lxvii. 36; etc.),—an example of laborious futility that almost justifies some of the strictures made of late upon Teutonic scholarship.

But Wildhagen was not the first to rely blindly upon Thorpe and ignore Tanger. Wichmann¹² in 1889, in his study of the

¹¹ The verse numbering followed by Wildhagen is that of Sweet in his edition of the Vespasian Psalter, and frequently differs from that of Thorpe.

¹² J. Wichmann, "König Aelfred's angelsächsische Uebertragung der Psalmen I-LI excl.," *Anglia* XI (1889), p. 42 f.

authorship and character of the West-Saxon Psalms, attempted to decide the important question whether the Anglo-Saxon prose version is translated from the accompanying Latin text or not, by citing nineteen evident discrepancies. Among them are twelve in which Thorpe's text is incorrect:¹³ vi. 8; vii. 9, 10; ix. 12; xxvi. 5 (two cases); xxvii. 1; xxxvi. 36 (two cases); xxxviii. 7, 9; xl. 2; and in at least nine of these when the correct text is secured the discrepancy disappears. Similarly Dr. Bruce,¹⁴ in comparing the Anglian Psalms with the Latin text for the same purpose, has cited twelve discrepancies, three of which (lvii. 4; cxv. 2; cxvii. 4) a consultation of Tanger would have removed. The conclusions drawn by Wichmann and Bruce, namely that neither West-Saxon nor Anglian Psalms are based upon the accompanying Latin, are both certainly correct, and I shall attempt later in this article to support them; but their reliance upon Thorpe is reliance upon a broken reed. In view, therefore, of the numerous cases in which scholars have been misled by Thorpe's so-called edition,¹⁵ it seems worth while to publish a collation of his Latin text with the original manuscript.

The present collation was made by the writer in the summer of 1905 at the Bibliothèque Nationale. It included both a verification of Tanger's readings,¹⁶ and an independent comparison of Thorpe's text with the original Paris Psalter. I have attempted to list all the variations from Thorpe, even those merely orthographical, except his constant substitution of v for u and j for i. Tanger, altho usually accurate, needs correction in a number of cases, and he is far from complete. Not only does he disregard smaller differences of orthography such as the variations between ae, æ, e, and e, ch and c, h and ch, and most cases of the omission or addition of h, all of which, as Wildhagen

¹³ Thorpe's verse numbering.

¹⁴ J. D. Bruce, *The Anglo-Saxon Version of the Book of Psalms commonly known as the Paris Psalter*. 1894, pp. 123-126 (*PMLA IX*).

¹⁵ Thorpe is also mentioned, strangely enough, as an important source for the reconstitution of the Roman text, by A. Rahlfs, *Der Septuaginta-Psalter*, Septuaginta Studien, Heft 2, Göttingen, 1907; but Rahlfs makes no detailed citations.

¹⁶ Tanger's readings were independently verified during the same summer by Professor James W. Bright, whose assistance is hereby gratefully acknowledged.

has demonstrated, are significant for the exact determination of the relation of texts, but he has overlookt a considerable number of larger changes introduced by Thorpe. In all, for the first fifty psalms Tanger notes about 225 distinct alterations of the text, and I have added about 75, making some 300 in all; the number of merely orthographical changes which I have noted is considerably larger. For the sake of completeness, all of Tanger's readings are here reproduced (followed in each case by a T), with any corrections that seem necessary.

The collation was limited to psalms i-l, or that portion of the Latin text that corresponds to the West-Saxon Psalms. If, as I believe will become evident, the Latin has only a fortuitous connection with either of the adjoining Anglo-Saxon versions, and merely offers another copy of the same general type of text as those found in the Vespasian, Junius, Royal, Eadwine's, and Cambridge Psalters, which have already been publisht, it will hardly be worth any future editor's while to reprint it; and perhaps the exact picture of the original which I trust this collation will supply for the first third of its extent will give sufficient basis for the determination of its relations to the other copies of the Psalterium Romanum as used by the Anglo-Saxon Church.

Ps. i. 1. "Von BEATUS ist B noch deutlich, E nur noch schwach sichtbar; von A ist wenig mehr als ein stück des querstriches übrig; darauf folgt ein brauner quadratischer fleck, der etwa den raum eines T bedeckt; im übrigen ist keine spur von anderen buchstaben erhalten" (T). habiit (T). cāthedra (T); rather cāthedra. pestilentie. 2. ac for last et. 4. décidet (T). quecunque. fécerit (T). 5. proici &. ventos. terre. 6. resurgunt (T).

Ps. ii. 1. fremuerun (T). 2. adstiterunt. terre. 3. Disrumpamus. proiciamus. 4. celis. inridebit. 5. conturbavit (T). 6. preceptum. Domini for last ejus (T). 8. terre. 9. figuli. 10. intellegite. omnes before qui (T). 12. Adprehendite. 13. in eum (T).

Ps. iii. 1. anime mee. 5. milia. 6. michi.

Ps. iv. 1. iusticie mee. me for mihi (T). 2. michi. 3. gravis (T). diligitis (T). queritis. 4. dum for cum. clamarem (T). 5. que for quae. & before in cubilibus (T). compungimini. 6. iusticie. 8. letitiam.

Ps. v. 1. intellege. mee *for* meae. 3. adstab. 5. locuntur.
7. misericordie tue. 12. letentur. eternum. 13. bone. tue.

Ps. vi. 2. michi *for* mei(T). 3. Et *for* Sed. Domine (*second time*) omitted (T). 5. singulos (T). 6. pre. 8. retrorsum *after* auertantur (T).

Ps. vii. 1. Dne *without sign of abbreviation* (T). 4. michi.
5. comprehendat. eam *after* comprehendat (T). 6. tuorum *for* meorum (T). 7. Et omitted (T). 8. *This verse includes iudica me domine from verse 9* (T). 9. super me *after* mearam (T). 10. Consummetur. dirige (T).

13. paravit (*second time*) omitted (T). effecit (T). 14. parturit (T). 15. effodit (T). incidit (T). 16. capite (T). descendit (T).

Ps. viii. 2. celos. lactantium (T). 3. destruam (T). 4. celos. tuos omitted (T). quas (T). 5. aud *for* aut. 7. uniuersa (T). 8. celi.

Ps. ix. 2. L&tabor. 3. perient (T). 4. aequitatem. 5. eternum. seculum saeculi. 6. T *reads* defecerun; *but ms. has* -nt. framea (T). 7. eternum. 8. equitate. 12. Adnuntiate. orationem *for* clamorem. 13. "St. ut hat der Cod. Uut; doch ist wol das goldene U nachträglich aus versehen dahin geraten, so dass es scheint, als ob hinter mortis ein neuer vers anfängt, im widerspruch zum ae., welches zu Thorpe stimmt." (T); *no new verse is indicated here.* filiae. 14. infixe. comprehensus. 15. comprehensus. 16. qui (T). 18. preualeat. 21. comprehenduntur. 22. laudator (T). anime sue. iniqua (T). benedicitur (T). 23. Irritabit. dominus (T). ire sue. inquir& *for* non quaeret (T). 24. pulluuntur. uie. eius *for* illius (T). 28. sedet omitted (T). 29. sicut *for* quasi. 30. adtrahit. "St. in laqueo hat ms. Iin; der fall ist hier derselbe wie oben v. 13" (T); *no new verse.* humiliauit (T). inclinauit (T). 31. usque *before* in finem (T). 34. dolorum (T). in manibus tuis (T). 36. eternum. seculum seculi. 38. adponat.

Ps. x. 1. anime mee. 2. tetenderunt (T). 3. que *for* quae. 4. celo. 5. palpebre. 6. hadit *for* odit (T). 7. Pluit (T). et omitted *before* sulphur. 8. justitiam (T). equitatem.

Ps. xi. 1. diminute. 2. Vana locuti sunt unusquisque (*mala omitted*) (T). locuti sunt mala (T). 3. maliloquam (T). 4. est *before* dominus (T). 5. exsurgam. 7. terre. 8. eternum.

Ps. xii. 1. VSQUEQuo *for* Quousque (T). quousque *for*

usquequo(T). avertis(T). 2. animam meam(T). 4. "4 umfasst im Codex auch noch 5 bis aduersus eum, ebenso ae. bis þonne he; v. 5 beginnt also im Codex mit Qui und þa; die beiden initialen fehlen jedoch"(T); Tanger seems wrong here: a new verse (no. 5) begins with Ne quando as in Thorpe, only the capitals have been omitted; v. 6 begins with Qui, and vs. 7 with Exultabit. in tua misericordia. sperabo(T). 6. michi.

Ps. xiii. 1. abhominabiles. 3. celo. 6. uelociter(T). 9. deum for Dominum(T). 10. deus for first Dominus(T). juxta for justa(T). confudisti. deus for Dominus (second time). 11. sue. 12. Letetur.

Ps. xiv. 1. habitauit(T). 4. mala(T). proximum suum(T). 5. nichilum. 7. hec. commovebitur(T).

Ps. xv. 1. indies (= indiges?) for eges(T). 3. Multipliati(T). enim after sunt(T). 4. ero omitted(T). illorum for second eorum(T). 5. hereditatis mee. meis for mei(T). michi. hereditatem. 6. michi. preclaris. hereditas. preclara. michi. 7. michi. 8. ad for a(T). michi. nec for ne. 10. infernum(T). 11. michi. vite. letitia.

Ps. xvi. 1. deprecationi mee(T). 2. equitatem. 6. michi. 7. "7 umfasst im lat. auch noch v. 8 bis tuę"(T). dexterę tuę. 8. adflickerunt. 10. Procientes. 11. predam. 12. Exsurge. préueni(T). framea inimicorum de manu tua(T). 13. a terra dispartire eos et supplanta eos in uita ipsorum; "damit schliesst der vers; das folgende ist im Codex zu v. 14 gezogen"(T). impletum(T). 14. pórcina(T). que for quae.

Ps. xvii. 3. mee. et before adjutor omitted(T). 4. iniquitates(T). 5. preuenerunt. 8. exardescet(T). 9. celos. calígo(T). 10. cherubin(T). 12. fulgora(T), carbónes(T). 13. celo. Altimus(T). 16. ire tue. 17. adsumpsit. 18. hode runt. 19. Preuenerunt. mee. 20. michi. michi. 22. reppuli.

or
23. c, um (cum corrected to corum; T reads c, am). 24. michi. 26. facias. 27. inluminas. inlumina. 28. temptatione. 29. inpolluta(T). uie(T). 30. preter. preter. 31. precinxit. uirtutem(T). inmaculatam. 33. prelum. posuit. ereum. 34. michi. 36. "Von cadent bis meos . . . im Codex zu v. 37 gezogen"(T). 37. precinxisti. 38. michi. hodientes. 40. illos for first eos(T). 41. capud(T). 42. cognouit(T). michi. ab for in(T). michi. 43. mentiti(T). michi. 44. mee for meae. 45. vindictam(T).

Ps. xviii. 2. eructuat(T). 3. loquele. 4. terrae. 6. gigans(T). célo. sé. 7. prestans. iustitie. recte. letificantes. preceptum. inluminans. "Von justitiae bis oculos . . . ist im Codex zu v. 8 gezogen"(T); Tanger is wrong: a new verse begins with Timor, as in Thorpe, but the gold of the T is faint. 8. "permanens: von ns ist nur der erste grundstrich des n noch schwach sichtbar, dahinter eine kleine lücke"(T); ms. has permanet. sèculum sèculi. 10. custodi&(T). ea for illa(T). in custo illa(sic)(T). 11. domine after me(T). 12. inmaculatus.

Ps. xix. 2. santo(T). 3. omnes(T). 5. Letabimur. 6. Impreat for faciat(T). faciat for fecit(T). celo. dextere. 7. Hii for hi (twice)(T). 8. resurreximus(T).

Ps. xx. 1. letabitur. exultauit. 2. anime. voluntatem. 3. preuenisti. 4. in seculum et omitted(T). 5. "Mit est gloria . . . schliesst fol. 20"(T).

Ps. xxi. 1. "Die worte Verba delictorum meorum beginnen im Codex v. 2"(T). 2. michi. 5. obprobrium. 8. mee. mee. 13. adhesit. 14. concilium. 17. aspice. 18. Deus omitted(T). 20. fratribus. ecclesie. 21. magnificate for glorificate(T). 23. aecclesia. 24. "24 umfasst im Codex auch noch 25 bis seculi"(T). 25. universe. terrae. 26. patrie. 27. terre. 29. Adnuntiabitur. adnuntiabant. celi.

Ps. xxii. 1. nichil. michi. pascue. 3. semitam(T). isttitie. 4. umbre. és(T). 7. Inpinguasti. preclarum. 8. uite mee.

Ps. xxiii. 1. ea for eo. 2. m^aria. eam(T). illam(T). 3. ascendit(T). 5. domino for Deo(T). deo for Domino(T). 6. Hec. querentium. 7. T reads porte for portas wrongly; ms.

has portas. porte for postes. eternales. glorie. 8. Quis, iste for Quis est iste. glorie. prelio. 9. porte eternales. glorie. 10. glorie. glorie.

xxiv. 2. inrideant. 3. michi. 5. Reminiscere miseracionum tuarum, domine, et misericordie tue, que a seculo sunt(T). 6. iuuentutis mee. ignorantie mee. "Hinter memor esto mei hat Codex noch deus, womit dieser vers schliesst; der rest des selben bei Thorpe bildet im Codex einen selbständigen vers, dem im Codex Thorpe's ae. v. 7 gegenübersteht. Thorpe's lat. v. 7 ist im Codex mit Thorpe's ae. v. 8 bis eac rihtwis zusammen gestellt . . . Thorpe's lat. v. 8 steht zusammen mit dem rest seines ae. v. 8 von Ealle bis lufiað; . . . Thorpe hat die hier

vorliegende unordnung trotz seiner willkürlichen abweichung vom ms. nicht beseitigt; sie ist jedoch leicht zu heben, wenn man die ersten drei zeilen seines ae. v. 8: 'For þinre godnesse, drihten, þu eart swete, and wynsum, and eac rihtwis' dem vers 6 anschliesst, wie Thorpe das im lat. mit 'propter bonitatem tuam, domine: dulcis et rectus dominus' getan hat. In vers 7 ist seine anordnung richtig, und von v. 8 ab herrscht auch im Codex wieder ordnung."(T). The confusion may be more clearly described as follows: in the Latin v. 7 should begin with Propter bonitatem tuam, v. 8 with Propter hoc legem, and v. 9 with Uniuersie uie Domini; in the Old English Thorpe's verse division correctly reproduces the ms., except that v. 9 should begin with Ealle Godes wegas; and the correspondence in sense is as follows: Latin v. 7 = Old English v. 8, Latin v. 8 = Old English v. 7, Latin v. 9 = Old English v. 9. 13. ms. has laque, pedes (o inserted in corrector's black ink). 14. "14 und 15 scheinen im Codex nur einen vers zu bilden, doch fehlen die initialen von Tribulationes und von And"(T); ms. has ribulationis, but clearly a new verse is intended. 15. dilatate. 16. omnia peccata for universa delicta(T). 17. hodio. hoderunt. 18. confundar for erubescam(T). 19. adheserunt michi.

Ps. xxv. 1. infirmabo. 2. tempta. 4. concilio. 6. circuibo for circumdabo (cf. Ps. xxvi. 7) (T). 7. laudis tue. et omitted(T). 8. domus tue. tabernaculis(T). glorie tue. 9. Deus omitted. "Mit iniuitates sunt . . . schliesst im Codex fol. 26"(T).

Ps. xxvi. 1. inluminatio. 2. defensor for protector(T). uite mee. 3. innocentes for nocentes(T). 4. proelium. 5. uite mee. "Die lücke im ae. v. 5 ist im Codex nicht bezeichnet, vielmehr steht And geseon etc. in gleicher höhe mit Unam etc. Der schluss von ut videam bis ejus fehlt im Codex"(T). 7. capud(T). 10. Et omitted before ne auertas(T). et present before ne declines. 12. adsumpsit. 13. michi. semita recta(T). 14. persequentium for tribulantium(T). mentita(T). 15. ms. has Cred, ere. "15 und 16 lat. und ae. bilden im Codex nur einen vers"(T).

Ps. xxvii. 1. nequando taceas a me omitted(T). 2. mee. 5. nequitia(T). secundum opera manuum eorum tribue illis omitted(T). 7. Destruere(T). edificabis. mee. 9. sue. 10. hereditati tue. usque before in seculum.

Ps. xxviii. 1. adferte (*twice*). 2. adferte (*twice*). 6. solitudinem *for* desertum. 7. preparantis. reualauit(T). 8. habit&(T). eternum. 9. uirtutum(T). Dominus omitted. et before benedicet.

Ps. xxix. 3. memorie. 4. in omitted before indignatione(T). 5. letitia. 6. in mea habundantia(T). eternum. 7. prestitisti. 8. Quę. 9. adnuntiabit. 10. michi *for* 'mei(T). 11. michi. precinxisti. letitia. cantem(T). 12. eternum.

Ps. xxx. 1. eternum. 2. "Inclinadme mit trennungsstrichen vor und hinter ad" (T); *I found no marks visible before or after ad as per T.* 3. michi. 4. fortitudo mea et omitted(T). et refugium meum *after* firmamentum meum(T). michi. 5. michi. 7. letabor. 8. me omitted. manus(T). 9. michi. 13. obprobrium. 19. Inlumina. 20. que. in omitted before contemptu(T). 21. tuę. 24. circumstantie. 26. mee. 27. habundantur(T).

Ps. xxxi. 1. remissee. 4. erumna. confringitur *for* configitur(T). spina(T). 7. orauit. adproximabunt. 8. michi, presura(T). que. 10. equis(T). 13. Letamini.

Ps. xxxii. 2. cordarum. ei *for* illi. 4. rectum. 5. celi. 6. thesauros(T). 8. Quoniam *for* Quia(T). 10. eternum. 11. hereditatem. 12. celo. preparato. 13. singillatim(T). in before omnia. 14. gigans. sue. 15. habundantia(T). sue. 16. "Hinter eum ist im Codex ein punkt, und dahinter heisst es: sperantes autem in misericordia eius" (*for et in eis, qui sperant super misericordia ejus*) (T). 17. "Hinter noster est im Codex ein punkt; dahinter: & in ipso letabitur u. s. w." (T).

Ps. xxxiii. 2. letentur. 3. in inuicem. 4. Inquisiui(T). 5. inluminamini. 7. Inmittit(T). 9. nichil. 12. uidere(T). 13. Coibe. 14. Deuerte. sequere *for* persequere. 18. his *for* iis(T). 19. Multe. 21. hoderunt. 22. in eum(T).

Ps. xxxiv. 1. inpugnantes. 2. Adprehende. exsurge. michi. 3. persecuntur. anime mee. 4. querunt. 5. michi. 6. adfligens(T). 7. uie. tenebre. 8. michi. in before interitum(T). supervacue omitted(T). 9. T reads ignorat, but ms. has ignorant. laqueo(T). incident(T). in idipsum(T). 10. exultauit(T). 11. inopum(T). egénüm(T). 12. Exsurgentes. que. michi. et after bonis(T). sterelitatem. anime mee. 13. dum *for* cum(T). michi. et before humiliabam. 14. ita *for* sic (*first time*). tamquam *for* quasi. ita *for* sic (*second*

time) (T). 15. letati. ignorauerunt (T). 17. eorum *after* male factis (T). 19. michi. hoderunt. annuebant (T). 20. michi. 22. Exsurge. 23. insultent in me *for* supergaudeant mihi (T). anime nostre. 24. pudore *omitted after* erubescant (T). pudore *for* confusione (T).

Ps. xxxv. 3. intellegere. 4. Adstitit. uię. bone. hodiuit. 5. celo. 8. tue (*twice*). 9. apud. uite. 10. Pretende. 11. michi. superbie. 12. omnes *omitted*.

Ps. xxxvi. 1. emulari. emulatus. 2. tamquam *for* sicut (T). fenum. sicut *for* quemadmodum (T). holera (T). 6. tamquam *for* quasi. 8. emuleris. 9. hereditatem. 10. et non *for* nec (T). queris (T). nec *for* et non (T). 12. fremit (T). inridebit. 13. et *omitted before* tetenderunt (T). deiciant. ínopem (T). trucidant (T). 14. conteretur (T). 17. inmaculatorum. hereditas. eternum. 20. soluet *for* commodat (T). commodat *for* tribuit (T). 22. nimis. 24. Juvenior (T). et *for* etenim (T). 25. cōmodat (T). 27. aeternum. 29. J of Justi *omitted* (T). hereditatem. sæculum. 32. querit. dampnabit. 34. libani (T). 35. Et *omitted before* transiui (T). et *omitted before* quesui. 36. ueritatem *for* innocentiam (T). equitatem *for* veritatem (T). reliquie. hominum (T). 37. reliquie. 39. eripiet *for* eruet (T).

Ps. xxxvii. 2. sagitte tuę infixe. michi. 3. ire tue. et *before* non (T). 4. mee. honus. grauate. 5. Computuerunt. cicatrices (T). mee. insipientie mee. 6. turbatus *for* curvatus (T). 7. completa. inlusionibus. 8. "Vv. 8 and 9 bilden im Codex nur einen vers" (T). 9. et *for* Domine (T). 11. adpropiauerunt *for* adpropinquaverunt (T). 12. querebant. michi. 13. uel ut *for* tamquam (T). sicut *for* velut (T). aperuit (T). 14. ut *for* velut (T). 15. me *omitted*. 16. ne aliquando *for* Nequando (T). insultent *for* supergaudeant (T). 17. ad *for* in (T). 19. Initial I *missing* (T). uiuent (T). hoderunt. 20. michi. michi. 21. mee.

Ps. xxxviii. 6. "Nach dem ae. argument ist das letzte fünftel von fol. 45v unbeschrieben. Auf fol. 46r fängt das Lat. an mit tas omnis homo, das Ae. wie bei Thorpe, nur dass die lückengezeichnung im Codex fehlt. Soweit v. 6 überhaupt vorhanden, ist er im Codex mit v. 7 zusammengeschrieben" (T). 7. in *omitted* (T); where in should be there has been an erasure. imaginem (T). dei *after* imaginem. conturbabitur (T). 8. "Vv. 8 und 9 sind ebenfalls im Codex zusammengeschrieben" (T).

Thesaurizat *for Congregat*(T). ignórat(T). congregat *for congregabit*(T). 9. que. nichil. ante *for apud*(T). 10. obprobrium. 11. T *reads tua for tuas wrongly; ms. has tuas. tua for tuae.* 13. Uerumptamen. "Vv. 13 und 14 im Codex zusammengezogen"(T). 14. lacrimas. 15. aput(T). 16. michi. priusquam.

Ps. xxxix. 1. miserie. fecis. 2. inmisit. 4. uanitate(T). 6. adnuntiaui. michi. 9. aeclesia. "Die worte Domine tu cognovisti bilden im Codex den anfang von v. 10"(T). 10. The ms. has a raised dot after Justitiam tuam, and no mark of punctuation after corde meo. abscondi *for celavi*(T). 11. celauí *for abscondi*(T). 12. semper omitted. 13. comprehendunt. meae. 15. Conplateat. eripias(T). 16. querunt. 17. michi. 18. michi. 19. letentur. querunt.

Ps. xl. 1. intellegit. liberauit(T). 2. faciet(T). 3. uniuersi strati (*Thorpe's Note*). 5. michi. periet(T). 6. si omitted(T). The ms. has no mark after viderent, but a raised dot after vana. 7. "7 umfasst im Codex von v. 8 auch noch die worte: in unum susurrabunt; ae. wie bei Thorpe"(T). 8. susurrabunt(T). michi. 9. adici&. mee. edebant(T). subplantationem. 10. illis for eis(T). 11. quoniam *for quia*(T). quia *for quoniam*(T). 12. eternum.

Ps. xli. 2. fontem omitted(T). 3. michi lacryme mee. michi cotidie. 4. Haec. 8. cataratarum(T). 10. uite mee. 11. reppulisti. tristis *for tristatus*(T). adfligit. 12. omnia before ossa(T). michi.

Ps. xlii. 2. reppulisti. adfligit. 4. letificat.

Ps. xliii. 1. adnuntiauerunt. 3. Initial M missing(T). adflisti. et omitted before expulisti. 5. inluminatio. complacuit tibi (apparently altered from complacuisti). 9. adfligentibus. hoderunt. 11. reppulisti. 12. pre. nos hoderunt *for oderunt nos. diripuebant*(T). 15. in before obprobrium. 19. Haec. 20. adflictionis. 23. estimati. 24. Exsurge (twice). 25. obliuiscens *for oblivisceris.* 26. adhesit. 27. Exsurge.

Ps. xliv. 2. scribe. 3. pre. V. 4 in the ms. begins with propterea benedixit(T). aeternum. 7. Sagitte tue acute. in omitted before corda(T). 8. Sedis(T). et omitted. 9. hodisti. letitie pre. 10. gradibus *for domibus.* filie. 11. ad dextris. de aurata(T). 13. filie. 14. filie. 15. fimbries(T). "Von Adduentur und von Eala kyning ab im Codex zu v. 16 gezogen"(T). 16. Afferentur

omitted(T). letitia. 19. æternum (*digraph used here for first time*).

Ps. xlvi. 1. que. 2. conturbabuntur(T). 3. turbate. aque. 4. letificat. "umfasst auch noch non commovebitur von v. 5"(T). 5. Conturbata. 7. que. 8. terre. conburet.

Ps. xlvi. 2. Rex magnus super omnem terram *omitted*(T). 4. he hereditatem [sic](T). 5. tube. 7. terra. 9. *ms reads* conguenerunt, *with the g partially erased between n and u; did the scribe start to write the Gall.* congregati sunt? dñi. terre.

Ps. xlvii. 2. exultationis uniuerse terre. syon. latere. 3. dinoscitur. 4. terre. 5. adprehendit. 7. eternum. 8. medio *omitted*(T). 9. terre. 10. Letetur. syon. filiae Jude. 11. syon. 12. Deus *omitted (second time)*. eternum.

Ps. xlviii. 1. hec. 2. terrigene. 4. aurem *after similitudinem*. 6. multitudine *omitted*. in habundantiarum. 7. redemit [*twice*] (T). anime sue. et *for* nec(T). laborauit(T). eternum. 8. morientes(T). 9. sepulchra. eternum. 12. Hec. 13. posita(T). depascit(T). 14. matutina(T). ueterescent(T). a *omitted before* gloria. 15. Verumptamen. liberauit(T). 17. haec. descendit(T). 19. eternum.

Ps. xlix. 2. exion *for* ex Sion(T). 5. uocauit(T). cœlum. 7. celi. 8. quoniam *before first* Deus(T). 10. tuo *for* tua. hyrcos. 11. mee. fere. 12. celi. 13. terre. 14. hyrcorum. 16. tue *after* tribulationis(T). 18. hodisti. T *reads* poste *for* postea, *wrongly*; *ms. has* post te. 20. T *reads* habundauit *for* abundauit; *but ms. has* habundabit. nequitiam(T). 21. tue. 22. Haec. iniqutatem *for* inique(T). tibi *for* tui(T). 23. illam *after* statuam. Intellegite haec. 24. T *reads* honoroficauit, *but ms. has* honorificauit. in *before* quo(T).

Ps. 1. 7. sapientę tue. michi. 8. hysopo. 9. letitiam. "Mit humiliata und blissian schliesst fol. 63 des Codex"(T). "fol. 64 fängt an mit adjutorem sibi (Th. Ps. li, v. 6, mitte), welches in gleicher Höhe steht mit den ae. anfangsworten fore ænigre"(T).

For the rest of the Psalter I have collated only Tanger's notes on the loss of pages from the manuscript.

Ps. lxvii. 28. "Codex fol. 79 schliesst mit gentes que . . . Zwischen diesem und dem folgenden blatte sind noch geringe spuren eines herausgerissenen blattes zu bemerken."(T).

Ps. lxxix. 18. "Mit uirtutum . . . schliesst im Codex fol. 97. Der rest eines blattes vor fol. 98 ist noch sichtbar"(T).

Ps. lxxx. 8. "gif þu etc. steht im Codex Thorpe's lat. v. 9 gegenüber, mit welchem fol. 98r anfängt" (T).

Ps. xcvi. 1. "Mit multe und gar sæge schliesst im Codex fol. 113; dahinter ist keine spur mehr von einem fehlenden blatte vorhanden" (T).

Ps. xcvi. 8. "Mit manibus und stundum beginnt im Codex fol. 114r" (T).

Ps. cviii. 30. "Dieser psalm schliesst ab mit fol. 132, welches selbst eingeschnitten ist; fol. 133 fängt an mit ruinas conquassauit [Th., ps. cix, v. 7]" (T).

Ps. cl. 3. "Mit tube·lau und ae. beman schliesst im Codex fol. 175v. Dieses, sowie das vorige blatt dicht am rücken weit eingeschnitten. Hinter fol. 175 ist ein blatt herausgeschnitten" (T).

The following table will make clearer the facts about these losses. They occur at nine places in the manuscript, and involve the loss of the following sections of the text:

1. After fol. 20: xx. part of 5-13, the W-S. Introduction, and xxi. part of 1 (in all, about 9 verses and an Intro.).
2. After fol. 26: xxv. part of 9, 10, 11, and Intro. to xxvi (2 + verses and an Intro.).
3. After fol. 45: xxxviii. 1-part of 6 (5 + verses).
4. After fol. 63: i. 10-20, li. 1-part of 6 (16 + verses).
5. After fol. 79: lxvii. part of 28-31 (3 + verses).
6. After fol. 97: lxxix, part of 18; lxxx. 1-8 (8 + verses).
7. After fol. 113: xcvi. 2-12, xcvi. 1-part of 8 (18 + verses).
8. After fol. 132: cix. 1-part of 7 (6 + verses).
9. After fol. 175: cl. part of 3-5 (2 + verses).

Besides the losses in the text there is no doubt that some of the missing pages contained additional matter, chiefly illustrations, which furnisht the motive for their excision. The position probably held by these illustrations reveals the scheme of division that was adopted in the Paris Psalter, a matter the importance of which Wildhagen (p. 424 f.) was the first to emphasize. By comparing the amount of text on the lost folios we can estimate which ones had space left for illustrations. A count of several sections of the psalter shows that the average folio page held, recto and verso together, about 12-13 verses. In the first case listed above, the missing matter would have

filled easily both sides of the page, and it is unlikely that any illustration was present, the more so since none of the other Anglo-Saxon psalters divide at this point. This page was probably lost by accident. In cases 2, 3, 5, 6, and 8, on the other hand, there was enough text to fill only one side of the page, the other side being doubtless occupied by the dividing illustration. Cases 4 and 7 must each have involved the loss of two folio pages, as already remarkt by Bouterwek (see Wichmann, p. 41); hence naturally, as Tanger notes, no trace of the excision is left. The missing text would have filled three sides, leaving a fourth for colophon, title, etc., between the West-Saxon and Anglian Psalms after ps. 1, and an illustration after ps. xcvi. In the last case, the end of ps. cl and perhaps a colophon probably occupied the recto of the missing page, and the verso may have contained one of the canticles. In the manuscript the next folio begins with the "Canticum Ezechie," which is elsewhere always preceded by the "Canticum Esaie Prophete," or, as it is otherwise called, the "Confitebur tibi." The "Confitebur tibi," which as Wildhagen notes (p. 469, note 6) is unaccountably missing from the Paris Psalter collection of liturgical pieces, has but 6 verses; and it is therefore not unlikely that it was originally present on the verso of the lost folio.

The total loss was thus probably eleven folio pages. The points of division markt were before pss. xxvi, xxxviii, lxviii, lxxx, xcvi, and cix. Nowhere else, unless possibly before ps. li, is there any indication of division either in the Latin or the Anglo-Saxon texts.

The conclusions to be drawn from an examination of the genuine Latin of P as above restored may be briefly indicated.

1. The Latin text of which the Paris Psalter furnishes a late copy (first half of the eleventh century) belongs not late, but fairly early in the succession of Anglo-Saxon psalters based on the Roman version. As a specimen of this version in its special Anglican form, it is most nearly allied to the Royal and Bosworth Psalters of the early tenth century, but seems to be earlier than either, and has some features that connect it with the Vespasian Psalter of the early eighth century.

Thorpe's alterations of the original are in large majority (about 250 of the 300) merely substitutions of the Vulgate,

which of course usually means the Gallican reading. With these spurious Ga readings removed, the text assumes a very different appearance from that which it presented to Wildhagen. A limited number of Ga readings, however, remain to be considered. They fall into three groups:

(a) Ga readings found also in all or several of the other psalters of the Roman type (A, B, C, D, and E only are available in published form). On Wildhagen's theory these must be counted as part of the original stock of Ga readings found in the primitive Anglican text. The following cases for the first fifty psalms are collected from Wildhagen's notes to the Cambridge Psalter, after eliminating the mistakes into which he was led by Thorpe (Thorpe's verse numbers when different are added in each case in parenthesis): vii. 13(12), 16(15); ix. 36(35); x. 8; xiv. 5(6); xvii. 3(2); xxi. 18(15); xxvi. 3(4); xxvii. 9(10); xxxi. 4; xxxiv. 13, 15; xxxvi. 21(20), 23(22); xliv. 5; xlvi. 9(8); xlix. 3.¹⁷

(b) Ga readings found only in the Latin of C and P. Wildhagen (p. 466, note 2) gives seventeen cases, which he considers proof of special later Ga influence on these two psalters. ("Teilweise finden sie sich zwar auch bei einem der Kirchenväter. Da aber sämtliche übrigen englischen Texte . . . an diesen Stellen geschlossen der Vorlage treubleiben, und andererseits nur der Pariser Psalter, der der neuen Fassung im lateinischen Teil die weitesten Konzessionen macht, mit dem Cambridger Texte zusammengeht, so kann hier einzlig und allein Beeinflussung durch das Psalterium Gallicanum vorliegen.") As a matter of fact, only nine of these readings actually occur in P, three in the first fifty psalms: xiii. 7(11); xvii. 7(5); xliv. 6(7), and six in the rest of the psalter: lxxix. 22(20); lxxxix. 13(15), 17(19); cii. 3(2); exi. 7(6); cxxxi. 11. There is no apparent reason why these cases, like the similar coinci-

¹⁷Cf. the partial list given by Wildhagen, p. 421, note 1. To these clear departures from Ro may be added the following, which, tho departing from the standard Ro text as given in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* **xxix**, are found in the *Psalterium Romanum* of Jac. Faber Stapulensis, *Quincuplex Psalterium*, Paris, 1513 (denoted by Wildhagen *Ro¹*): iii. 6(4); ix. 26(24), 33(32); x. 4(3); xvii. 23(22), 33(31), 34(32), 40(37); xviii. 10(8); xx. 5(4); xxi. 3(2); xxvii. 4(5); xxxvii. 12(11); xxxix. 15(16); xliv. 9(10), 10(11), 11(12).

dences that occur between P and the earlier psalters,¹⁸ should not be treated exactly as the cases listed under (a).

(c) Ga readings found only in P. A comparison of the genuine text of P with Lindelöf's convenient parallel edition of ten psalms from eleven psalters¹⁹ shows P adhering closely to the text of the five Roman psalters collated (A-E). Of the very numerous variants from these noted by Lindelöf in the text of his six Gallican psalters (F-K), P agrees with F-K against A-E in only five instances: vii. 17(16); ix. 18(16), 19(17); lxxxix. 11(13); cxxxvi. 7(9).²⁰ So small a total of peculiar Ga readings may be paralleled in the other psalters without difficulty. Most of them no doubt are part of the original readings that have happened to be eliminated from all other surviving copies. Some of them might possibly be eliminated from P by a further scrutiny of the manuscript, especially in the second and third "fifties." The rest are probably due to the latest copyist of the manuscript (Wulfwine or his successor? cf. Bruce, p. 10 f.). That Wulfwine, altho he copied a Roman text, was familiar with the Gallican, which he probably knew by heart, is indicated by several slips that he has himself tried to correct: e. g. xvii. 24(23), cum (Ga) corrected to corum, for Ro coram; xxxii. 4, Quoniam rectum est sermo domini (Ro, rectus; scribe evidently thinking of Ga Quia rectum est uerbum domini; Thorpe changes rectum to rectus); xlvi. 10(9), Conguenerunt, with g partially erased (Ro, conuenerunt; Ga, con-

¹⁸ Cf. the Ga readings found in PB: xxxix. 5(4); in PE: xxxiii. 21(20); in PD: xxxvi. 14(13); in PAB: x. 8; in PDE: xlviii. 12(9); in PABDE: xxxiv. 13 and xxxv. 12(11); in PAC: lvi. 5(4); in PCE: xxvii. 4(3) and lxxxix. 2.

¹⁹ Uno Lindelöf, *Studien zu altenglischen Psalterglossen*, Bonner Beiträge XIII, 1904.

²⁰ In the remaining psalms of the first fifty I have noted the following seventeen cases where P agrees with the Vulgate (hence presumably with Ga) against RoABCDE: v. 4(2), et om. before exaudies; vi. 7(5), singulos for -as; xi. 7, probatum before terrae; xiv. 5(6), innocentes for -em; xvi. 2, tui for mei after oculi; xvii. 16(15), terrarum for terrae; xvii. 21(20), puritatem for innocentiam; xxi. 12(9), quoniam for et before non est; xxi. 26(23), laus mea for laus mihi; xxi. 28(25), uniuersae for -si; xxxv. 13(12), omnes om.; xxxvi. 35(34), sicut for super; xlvi. 5(6), adhuc before confitebor; xlvi. 5(4), in om. before hereditatem; xlvi. 10(9), populorum for populi; xlviii. 9(7), et for nec before pretium; xlix. 22(23), deum for dominum.

gregati sunt) ; xlivi. 4(5), complacuittibi, altered from complacuisti (apparently the scribe first wrote the Ga complacuisti, then altered the last three letters to form the Ro complacuit tibi). Other slips into the Gallican of the same sort may well have escaped his notice. It is surprizing that there are not more of them.

Indeed, the Paris Latin text preserves the features of the primitive Anglican type with remarkable fidelity, rivaling in this respect even the Vespasian Psalter. Wildhagen has listed (on p. 421) 94 test passages, departures from the regular Roman version which he believes were found in the original common source of the eight English psalters. All but nine of these (xxxix. 5(4) ; xlivi. 23(24) ; xliv. 9(10) ; lxviii. 36(37) ; lxxvi. 13(10) ; lxxviii. 4; ciii. 32(30) ; cvi. 10(9) ; cxlii. 10(11)—are retained in P, aside from three others that happen to fall on the missing pages. Ten of them have disappeared from the Latin of the Vespasian Psalter. Twenty-eight of these peculiar readings have been eliminated in Thorpe's edition.

Another group of peculiar readings are of special significance because they establish a connection between the Latin text of P and the psalters of the tenth century. Wildhagen (p. 452) cites a group of ten readings, neither Ro nor Ga, found in the Royal, Bosworth, Eadwine's, and Cambridge Psalters, but not in the earlier Vespasian or Junius. With some reason he finds in the introduction of these the effect of the rising tide of Benedictine influence which began to be felt in the first half of the tenth century. Seven of these are found also in P: xxv. 7; xxxi. 4; xxxiii. 15(14); lxii. 7(6), 11(8); lxvii. 19; lxviii. 16(15). Wildhagen sees influence from the Benedictine liturgy also in the numerous cases of the insertion of "Domine" in DLEC ; of this P has no less than nine examples: iv. 2; viii. 6; xxvii. 2; xxx. 5; ci. 14; cxviii. 4, 49, 142, 165. At the same time it must be noted that P does not go so far in this direction as the other psalters of the group: cf. the readings at xvii. 24, xxi. 9, and lvii. 2, found in DLEC, but *not* in P,—a fact that suggests that P dates from a little earlier period in the movement.

Two other features of the Paris Psalter Latin text bear out these indications of its early character. They are the appended collection of liturgical pieces, and the system of psalter division.

The liturgical matter regularly appended to the psalters²¹ affords, as Wildhagen has shown, a valuable criterion of date. Oldest and most general are the seven canticles from the Old Testament sung at matins, one for each day in the week. These alone are found in the seventh century Salaberga Psalter, the oldest surviving psalter of English origin; and they begin the collection in each of the others. The Vespasian adds the Benedictus and Magnificat, which came later into use for daily matins and vespers. The Royal and Bosworth add the Nunc Dimittis, used daily at compline, which was of course the last of the daily services to come into general use. The Royal has also the "Quicumque vult" and "Gloria in excelsis," the Bosworth the "Quicumque vult" and "Te Deum," these three hymns, according to Wildhagen, having been introduced into England first in the tenth century under Benedictine influence. Eadwine's and the Cambridge Psalter are the most comprehensive: they both have all the thirteen pieces mentioned and also the Apostle's Creed, the spread of which in England was likewise connected with Benedictinism. The Paris Psalter has ten pieces (or eleven, if we assume that the hymn "Confitebur tibi" was originally present on one of the lost leaves, as suggested above). Like the Vespasian, it has the original seven Old Testament pieces, with the Benedictus and Magnificat; like the Bosworth, it adds the "Te Deum," and like Royal and Bosworth, the "Quicumque vult"; but it has neither the compline hymn "Nunc Dimittis" nor the Apostles' Creed. It would thus seem to occupy a position after the Vespasian and before the Royal and Bosworth Psalters,—the same position which we have seen to be suggested by the textual readings.

A similar result is obtained by comparing the systems of psalter division indicated by the position of the illuminations in the manuscripts. The meaning of these facts was first revealed by Goldschmidt,²² and first applied to the English psalters by Wildhagen (p. 423 f.). Briefly outlined, the results are as follows: Four systems of division are found in the psalters that

²¹ Found in all nine of the Roman psalters except the Junius and Blickling, from which manuscripts the latter portions are missing.

²² Adolph Goldschmidt, *Der Albani-Psalter in Hildesheim und seine Beziehung zur symbolischen Kirchensculptur des XI. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin, 1895.

we have been considering. The simplest, and perhaps the oldest, is the two-fold division before ps. cix, between the portions of the psalter used in the nocturnal and diurnal services of the breviary. Equally old in England, and always combined with the first, is the Roman system, which markt with special prominence the seven psalms used at vigils in the Roman Office for each day of the week: viz., pss. i, xxvi, xxxviii, lii, lxviii, lxxx, and xcvi; sometimes pss. xvii and cxviii were also distinctly markt for similar liturgical purposes. Third, the Irish division, so called because it seems to have originated in Ireland and spread thence wherever the influence of Irish missionary effort extended, gave prominence to the beginnings of pss. i, li, and ci, thus dividing the psalter into three equal "fifties." Finally, the Benedictine system, resting upon the highly developt Benedictine liturgy, markt no less than sixteen points in the psalter: i, xx, xxvi, xl, lix, lxviii, lxxiii, lxxxv, xcvi, cxviii, cxix, cxxxiv, cxxxviii, cxli, cxliv. 10, cxlviii. In the south of England we find the Roman system originally prevailing, along with the division at ps. cix; and this is exemplified in the Vespasian Psalter. In the north, naturally, the Irish method was as old or older; and so in the two early northern psalters, Salaberga and Blickling, the Roman and Irish systems appear united. At a later period the Irish system came into general use thruout England, introduced mainly, Wildhagen thinks, from the Continent, where it had become entrenched by the influence of the great monasteries of Irish origin. The Junius Psalter has both Roman and Irish marking, as well as special prominence for ps. cxix; the latter feature being perhaps a first sign of Benedictine influence. The other four psalters of our group agree in dropping the Roman system altogether. The Royal and Cambridge Psalters have only the Irish division at pss. i, li, and ci, together with cix; Eadwine's divides only at ps. cix; the Bosworth, most elaborate of all, unites the Irish with the complete Benedictine system. Here again the Paris Psalter stands conspicuously close to the Vespasian. As we have seen above from our study of the missing pages, the places markt were at pss. i, xxvi, xxxviii, lxviii, lxxx, xcvi, and cix (ps. lii is passed over, apparently by accident); i. e., the primitive Roman points of prominence are markt, and those only. - There is not a trace of the Benedictine system, nor of the Irish. The absence in the Paris Psalter of

the Irish tripartite division,²³ so widespread in the later psalters of the Roman group (and in nearly all of the Gallican) is especially remarkable; for we have in the accompanying West-Saxon Psalms the most conspicuous exemplification extant of this curious Irish custom. There can be little doubt that the limitation of the prose version to the first "fifty" rests originally in some way upon such a partition of the psalter.²⁴ Its absence in the Latin text is a strong indication both of the derivation of the Latin from a fairly early source, and of its entire lack of connection with the West-Saxon Psalms.

2. The Latin text of the Paris Psalter is unconnected with the West-Saxon Psalms, which must have been translated from an altogether different original. Whereas the Latin text, as we have seen, supplies an early and primitive type of the Roman version as it was carried to England, the West-Saxon Psalms are clearly based on a very late type of this text, with many Gallican readings found in none of the other Roman psalters.

A large proportion of Thorpe's changes were evidently made to obtain greater agreement between the adjoining Latin and Anglo-Saxon, especially when, as is very frequently the case, the West-Saxon Psalms follow a Gallican reading not to be found in the Latin. As a result of Thorpe's efforts the two texts in his edition do show a general agreement, tho even there far from a complete one. Wildhagen was led by this factitious correspondence to believe (p. 469) that they came from the same source, and that the differences were due to scribal changes in the Latin. That the truth is precisely opposite will appear from the following list of cases where Thorpe has turned an authentic disagreement into an induced agreement of the two texts. (P = the genuine Latin text; Th = Thorpe's Latin; W-S = version of the West-Saxon Psalms.) There are four groups:

- a. Where P = Ro, and Th = Ga (or Vulgate) = W-S.
- b. Where P differs from Ro but = ABCDE (i. e. has one of

²³ The absence of any marking before ps. ci is decisive of this. There was some sort of separation between pss. I and II, but this was manifestly due to the necessity here of marking the end of the West-Saxon and the beginning of the Anglian Psalms.

²⁴ More fully discussed by the writer in the *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, 1912, p. 486 f.

the peculiar Anglican readings); and Th = Ga (sometimes also = Ro) = W-S.

- c. Where P differs from both Ro and ABCDE (i. e. has a peculiar or manifestly mistaken reading; and Th = GaRoABCDE = W-S).
- d. Where P = RoGaABCDE, and Th = W-S (i. e., Thorpe has deliberately, tho not always successfully, introduced a peculiar reading of his own to get closer agreement with the Anglo-Saxon).

A few of the more striking examples under each head will be given in full (verse numbering Thorpe's):

a.

- vii. 6, in finibus inimicorum tuorum: on minra feonda mearce (ThGa, meorum).
- vii. 9, secundum innocentiam manuum mearum super me: æfter minre unsæðfulnessse (ThGa om. super me; Ga, secundum innocentiam meam).
- xii. 1, quousque auertis: hu lange wilt þu ahwyrfan (ThGa, usquequo avertes).
- xxii. 3, super semitam: ofer þa wegas (ThGa, semitas).
- xxviii. 6, solitudinem . . . desertum: þa westan eorðan . . . þa westen stowe (ThGa, desertum . . . desertum).
- xxxii. 16, sperantes autem in misericordia eius: and ofer þa þe hopiað to his mildheortnesse (ThGa, et in eis qui sperant super misericordia ejus).
- xxxiv. 15, ignorauerunt: ic nyste (ThGa, ignoravi).
- xxxvii. 9, Et: Drihten (ThGa, Domine).
- xxxviii. 9, substantia mea tanquam nichil ante te est: mid þe is eall min æht (Th, apud for ante; Ga, substantia mea apud te est).
- xl. 6, Et: þeah (ThGa, Et si, taken by translator as Etsi).
- xli. 2, ad Deum uiuum: to Gode for þam he is se libbenda wylle (ThGa, ad Deum fontem vivum).
- xliv. 10, a gradibus eburneis: of þinum elpanbænenum husum (ThGa, domibus).
- xlviii. 6, in habundantiarum suarum (sic): þære mycelnesse hiora speda (Th, multitudine abundantiarum suarum; Ro, in abundantia diuitiarum suarum; Ga, in multitudine divi-

tiarum suarum. P is evidently intended for the Ro reading, whereas W-S translates Ga).

xlix. 22, existimasti iniquitatem: þu ræswedest swiðe unryhte (ThGa, inique). Other examples may be found at ii. 6, 10; vi. 3; xv. 8; xxvi. 13; xxvii. 7; xxxiv. 19, 23; xxxvi. 24; xl. 8.

b.

xiii. 10, confudisti (ABCDEP): gedrefe ge (ThGaRo, confundistis).

xxix. 11, ut cantem tibi gloria mea (CDEP): þæt min wuldor and min gylp þe herige (ThGaRoAB, ut cantet).

xxxvii. 6, turbatus (ABCDEP): gebiged (ThGaRo, curvatus).

xlviii. 7, Frater non redemit, redemit homo (ABCDEP): þæt nan broðor oþres sawle nele alysan . . . gylde for þy him sylf, and alyse his sawle (ThGaRo, redimit redimet; apparently the W-S translates the reading redimet redimet of Ro¹; see Wildhagen's note to this passage in his ed. of the Cambridge Psalter).

Other examples may be found at ii. 13; vii. 16; xvii. 8; **xxxi.** 7; **xxxiv.** 10; **xxxvi.** 24; **xxxvii.** 16; **xl.** 1; **xlix.** 5.

c.

viii. 3, ut destruam: for ðam þu towyrpest (ThGaRoABCDE, ut destruas).

xxvi. 3, innocentes (sic): mine fynd (ThGaRoABCDE, nocentes).

xxxiv. 8, exprobrauerunt animam meam: idle hi wæron þa hi me tældan (ThGa, supervacue exprobaverunt animam meam; RoABCDE, uane for superuacue).

xlvi. 2, Dominus summus terribilis super omnes deos: swyþe heah God and swyþe andryslic and swiþe micel Cynincg ofer ealle oþre godas (Th adds, Rex magnus super omnem terram; Ga, Dominus excelsus terribilis rex magnus super omnem terram; RoABCDE, Deus summus terribilis et rex magnus super omnes deos).

Other examples: **ix.** 23, 30; **xiv.** 1; **xxx.** 8; **xxxv.** 12; **xxxix.** 12; **xxxix.** 12; **xlivi.** 3, 25; **xlvii.** 8.

d

xxiii. 5, a Domino . . . a Deo (so RoGaABCDE) : fram Gode . . . æt Drihtne (Th, a Deo . . . a Domino).

xxiii. 7, 9, eleuamini, porte éternales . . . eleuamini, porte éternales (so RoGaABCDE) : onhlidaþ þa ecan geata . . . onhlidað eow, ge ecan geatu (Th, elevamini postes æternales . . . elevamini, porte æternales. Thorpe's change here was a happy inspiration, for it would explain the curious difference in the W-S rendering of the two verses; but I have found no source for his reading).

xxiv. 6-8, cf. Thorpe's deliberate change of verse division.

xxxviii. 8, Thesaurizat et ignorat cui congregat ea (so ABCDE; Ro, congreget; Ga, congregabit) : hy gaderiað feoh and nyton hwam hy hyt gadriað (Th, Congregat et ignorat cui congregabit ea).

xlviii. 7, et laborauit in eternum (so RoAB; GaCDE, et laborabit) : hu he on ecnesse swinca mæge (Th, nec laborabit in eternum; the passage is difficult, but Thorpe's change is unnecessary; W-S probably followed Ga). See also **xxxvii.** 13 and **xlviii.** 15.

It would, however, be wrong to leave the impression that Thorpe's changes are always made for the sake of getting a closer agreement with the Anglo-Saxon version. Frequently he alters merely to correct or smooth the Latin, or for no apparent reason, except to bring the text of P nearer to the Vulgate. Indeed, where the West-Saxon Psalms are translated from a Roman or a peculiar Anglican reading, Thorpe's alterations often destroy an agreement that was originally present. Some of the clearest and most interesting of these cases may be cited:

vi. 8, auertantur retrorsum: and gan hy on earsling (ThGa, avertantur).

viii. 7, oues et boves, uniuersa insuper et pecora campi (so also ABCDE) : sceap and hryðera and ealle eorðan nytenu (ThGa-Ro, oves et boves universas, insuper et pecora campi).

xvi. 12, framea inimicorum de manu tua (so B; RoACDE, frameam) : of þære wræce minra feonda alys me mid þinre handa (ThGa, frameam tuam ab inimicis manus tuae).

xvii. 12, Prae fulgora (for praefulgora, nom. plur. of adj. praefulgorus; so D; C, Prefulguae or -ra; E, Prefulguae; ABRoGa, Prae fulgore) in conspectu eius nubes transierunt: and þa urnan swa swa ligetu beforan his ansyne (Th, Prae fulgore; cf. Wildhagen's note to passage in Cambridge Psalter).

xvii. 33, posuit: he gedyde (ThGa, posuisti).

xxvii. 1, ne sileas a me: ne swuga (ThGa, ne sileas a me nequando taceas a me).

xxvii. 5, Th adds, secundum opera manuum eorum tribue illis, with Ga; om. in P and W-S.

xxx. 4, firmamentum meum et refugium meum: min trymnes and min gebeorh (Th, fortitudo mea et firmamentum meum; Ga, fortitudo mea et refugium meum).

xxxvii. 15, Tu exaudies, Domine (so ABCDE): Gehyr ðis, Drihten (ThGaRo, Tu exaudies me, Domine).

xxxviii. 7, Quamquam imaginem Dei ambulet homo (sic; in erased after Quamquam; ABCDE, in imagine): And swa þeah ælc man hæfð Godes anlicenesse on him (Th, Quamquam in imagine ambulet homo; Ro, Quamquam in imagine Dei ambulat homo; Ga, Verumtamen in imagine pertransit homo).

xlix. 18, post te: under bæc fram þe (Th, postea; Ga, retrorsum; did the W-S translator read retrorsum post te?).

Other examples: vii. 5, 7, 10, 14; viii. 4; ix. 12; xi. 2; xii. 5; xiii. 10; xvii. 3, 23; xix. 6; xx. 4; xxv. 9; xxvi. 14; xxviii. 7, 9; xxxii. 17; xxxiv. 24; xxxvi. 36; xli. 12; xliv. 16; lvii. 12; lxviii. 4; xl ix. 8, 16. Note also the changes in verse division which Thorpe has made at xvi. 7-8; xxi. 1-2; xxxix. 9-10; xl. 7-8; xl v. 4-5.

The 56 discrepancies given above by no means exhaust the list. They include merely those affected by Thorpe's changes of the Latin text. A complete list, which would include from among the nineteen cases cited by Wichmann ten (viz., vii. 9, xvi. 15, xxvii. 2, xxx. 24, xxxi. 6, xxxix. 6, xli. 9, xxxviii. 9, xl. 2, xl v. 5) that are not vitiated by the recovery of the correct text, would be long and would necessitate another paper. The instances here collected are enough to show the utter divergence of the two texts, and to indicate the strong Gallican tincture (about 30 of

the W-S readings cited are distinctively Gallican where P is not Gallican) of the West-Saxon Psalms. Thus we get the curious result that, altho Wildhagen's conclusions with regard to the date and character of the Paris Psalter Latin are inadmissible, conclusions very similar seem required for the accompanying West-Saxon Psalms.

3. The Paris Psalter Latin is also unconnected with the Anglian Psalms. These, however, are translated from a very similar type of text, which had comparatively few Gallican readings, and was distinctly earlier in character than the original of the West-Saxon Psalms.

As we have seen above, Bruce has already demonstrated that the Anglian Psalms could not have been based on the accompanying Latin, altho in three of the cases cited by him Tanger's restored text happens to agree with the Anglo-Saxon version. Much more often, however, Tanger's restorations reveal additional divergencies which Thorpe's perversions had concealed. Accordingly the following discrepancies may be added to Bruce's list (Ang = Anglian Psalms) :

- liv. 13, Th adds the Ga, in domo Dei (om. by P) : on Godes huse (RoABCDE, in domo Domini).
- lv. 9, Th adds tota die (om. by PRoGaABCDE) : ealne dæg.
- lix. 4, electi tui (so RoABCDE) : leofe þine (ThGa, dilecti tui).
- lxi. 7, In Deo salutari meo (so ABC) : On Gode standeð min gearu hælu (ThGaRoDE, In Deo salutare meum).
- lxxii. 19, Tenuisti manum dexteram meam in voluntate tua: þu mine swyðran hand sylfa gename, and me mid þinon willan well gelæddest (ThGaRoABCDE, Tenuisti manum dexteram meam, et in voluntate tua deduxisti me).
- lxxvii. 9, Et: þæt (ThGaRoABCDE, Ut).
- xcv. 9, in nationibus (so RoABCDE) : on cynnum and on cneorissum (ThGa, in gentibus).
- ciii. 18, in tempore (so ABCDE) : on þa mæran tid (ThGaRo, in tempora).
- cxviii. 147, in uerbum tuum (so CDE) : on ȝinum wordum (ThGa, in verba tua; RoAB, in uerbo tuo).
- cxxxii. 13, super sedem meam (so RoABCDE) : on þinum setle (ThGa, super sedem tuam; cf. gloss to E, ofer setl þin).

- cxxxvi. 1, dum recordaremur tui, Sion (so RoABCDE) : þonne we Sion gemunan swiðe georne (ThGa, dum recordaremur Sion).
 cxlvii. 7, flauit (so ACDE) : blaweð (ThGaRo, flabit).

Bruce's valid examples of divergence are nine in number, in all of which the Anglian Psalms follow the regular Roman reading, while the Latin either has a reading peculiar to itself (ci. 25, cvi. 38), one shared by one or more of the group ABCDE (lxv. 3, lxxvi. 2, lxxvii. 62, cviii. 28, cxiv. 4), or a Gallican reading (cxxxviii. 17, exl. 3). Besides these Bruce mentions (p. 126) five other discrepancies in which the Anglian Psalms follow an Old Latin reading (lxxvi. 11, xc. 2, xci. 10, cxviii. 165, cxix. 4), and two (ciii. 14, cxviii. 151) in which they follow the Gallican; in all seven of these the Latin text has the regular Roman reading. Finally, four other cases remain to be cited:

- lxii. 4, leuabo manus meas (so ThGaRoABCDE) : ic . . . mine handa þwea (probably merely the translator's mistake for lauabo; cf. Grein's note).
 ciii. 30, Qui respicit terram (so ThGaRo) : He on þas eorðan ealle locað (ABCDE, Qui respicit in terram).
 cxxxii. 11, eam (so ThGaC) : hine (RoABDE, eum).
 cxxxii. 12, super sedem meam (so ThRoABCDE) : ofer þin heahsetl (Ga. super sedem tuam).

Thus in all there are 32 cases of divergence between the two texts,—a number ample to show their independence, but small compared to the total that may be gathered from the first fifty psalms. In only nine of these cases do the Anglian Psalms follow Gallican readings not found in the Latin, a number which again is negligible compared with the constant dependence upon the Gallican version on the part of the translator of the West-Saxon Psalms. The facts suggest, tho alone they would of course in no way demonstrate, a date for the original of Ang later than P, but distinctly earlier than the original of W-S.²⁵

²⁵The order indicated is borne out by a consideration of the very different exegetical sources used in the two Anglo-Saxon versions, an aspect which will be treated fully in the forthcoming edition of the West-Saxon Psalms.

The compiler of the Paris Psalter has thus united in his very composite manuscript three texts which certainly had no previous connection whatever. One of his sources, clearly the oldest, was a copy of the Roman version of the entire psalter having numerous primitive Anglican textual features, a very early system of psalter division, and a fairly early collection of liturgical addenda. This Latin original can hardly have been later than the beginning of the tenth century, and may have gone back to the ninth. His second source was an Anglo-Saxon metrical translation of the entire psalter, made fairly late, as the character of the meter shows, but from an early and distinctively Anglican type of the Roman version. Thirdly, he had before him a recent translation of the first "fifty" in the late West-Saxon prose, based upon a Latin original which adhered to the Roman text in the main, but which liberally admitted Gallican readings to a considerably greater extent than any other English copy or version of the Roman psalter preserved to us. There is no evidence that this prose translation ever extended beyond its present limit. Apparently it was regarded by the compiler as his greatest treasure, for in its favor he discarded the first third of his metrical translation, parts of which were destined to survive in a copy of the Benedictine Officium. A fourth volume in his scriptorium furnished him with his last ingredient,—a set of brief rubrics in Latin for the entire psalter. This "Collectio Argumentorum," made use of in several of the later Anglo-Saxon psalters, reveals a dependence upon much the same sources as the West-Saxon Psalms,²² and may indeed have been a sort of preliminary study of their translator's; but if so, these two are the only elements of the whole compilation with any inherent connection. To the student of the West-Saxon and Anglian Psalms, accordingly, their accidental companion the Latin text of the Paris Psalter has no further interest than attaches to any copy of the Roman version bequeathed to us from the Anglo-Saxon Church.

ROBERT L. RAMSAY.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI.

²² See Bruce, pp. 17-24; and "Theodore of Mopsuestia in England and Ireland," *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, 1912, pp. 488-497.

V.—THE BEGINNING OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

In the first act of Goethe's drama, Faust tries to translate the beginning of the metaphysical prologue to the Fourth Gospel: he is dissatisfied with the traditional rendering *In the beginning was the Word* and prefers the translation *Im Anfang war der Sinn*; but then he thinks it ought to be *Im Anfang war die Kraft*, and finally he writes *Im Anfang war die Tat*. Goethe's *Sinn* means *Mind* (*νοῦς*) or *Reason* (*λόγος*): German *unsinnig* is synonymous with *unvernünftig*, just as our *sensible* may mean *reasonable*, and *senseless*: contrary to reason. *Mind* may be used for German *Sinn*; the German phrase for *to change one's mind* is *seinen Sinn ändern* or *anderen Sinnes werden*. Our *to have in mind* is in German: *im Sinne haben*. Greek *λόγος* denotes both *word* and *reason*; logic is the science of reasoning. Thomas Hobbes (1651) says in his *Leviathan* (1, 4): The Greeks have but one word, *λόγος*, for both *speech* and *reason* (cf. Frauenstädt's *Schopenhauer-Lexikon* 2, 338). In Syriac, *mēlīlā* means *endowed with speech and reason*; Syr. *millētā* denotes *the faculty of speech or thought*, reason, energy of mind. Saadia's Arabic version of the Pentateuch (EB¹¹ 24, 532b)¹ has for *and man became a living soul* (Gen. 2, 7): Adam became *nafs nāfiq* = ζῆν λογικόν. Arab. *nāfiq* means *endowed with the faculty of speech and reason*; the noun *nūfūq* denotes both *speech*, articulated human language, and *reason*, intellect. Goethe's *Kraft* signifies *Force*, i. e. what modern physicists call *energy*. Helmholtz's epoch-making paper on the conservation of energy (1847) was entitled *Über die Erhaltung der Kraft*. The title of Büchner's work on force and matter (1855) is *Kraft und Stoff*. Goethe's *Tat* means *action*, i. e. energy manifested in outward acts, motions and changes; exertion of power or force. In *Wilhelm Meister's Lehrjahre* (vol. 10, p. 108 of the edition of the Bibliograph. Institut) we read: *Das erste und letzte am Menschen ist die Tätigkeit* (cf. p. 820 of H. S. Chamberlain's *Die Grundlagen des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*). The

¹ For the abbreviations see *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. 38, p. 142.

German term *Tatkraft* for *energy*, which was coined in the eighteenth century, is a compound of *Tat* and *Kraft*. Energy is actual exertion of power.

The various renderings of *λόγος* in Goethe's *Faust* are alluded to in a letter of Moltke, written in November 1883, to the historian Ludwig Hahn. The great strategist says there: For many years people have talked of German unity, have glorified it in verse and song; they held meetings, rifle-corps festivals, and passed resolutions. As long as they translated the *Logos* as the *word*, nothing came of it. Only when some one thought of *Force*, when the emperor in conjunction with Roon created the army, and when Bismarck made *Action* inevitable, there was creation. But now again the Word predominates.

While *λόγος* at the beginning of the Johannine Gospel (c. 135 A. D.) may mean both *Word* and *Reason*, it cannot denote *Force* or *Action*. These terms are not given as translations of *λόγος* in *ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος*, but indicate what, according to Faust, the author of the Fourth Gospel should have written (note l. 1233: *Es sollte stehn*). The rendering *Sinn* = Reason and the substitutes *Kraft* = Force and *Tat* = Action, it may be supposed, go back to Herder. Professor Günther Jacoby, of Greifswald, published a book in 1911, entitled *Herder als Faust*, in which he tried to show that many of Herder's remarks and ideas were utilized in Goethe's *Faust*, and that Faust's experience reflects Herder. This latter statement is true to a certain extent, at any rate so far as the first part of Goethe's *Faust* is concerned, and I am convinced that many of Faust's philosophical and religious ideas were inspired by Herder; cf. Max Morris' review of Jacoby's book in *Euphorion*, vol. 20, parts 1 and 2, p. 217 (Leipsic, 1913) and Eugen Kühnemann's *Herder* (Munich, 1912), p. 235; also BL xxii. xxxiv. xxxvi. Even the great Biblical critic W. M. L. de Wette was much influenced by Herder (RE^s 21, 190, l. 27; see also 5, 677, l. 7).

The English translations (there are nearly forty) of the lines (1224-1237) in Goethe's *Faust*, referring to the beginning of the Fourth Gospel, are unsatisfactory. A. Hayward (London, 1864) and Anna Swanwick (New York, 1884) render: *In the beginning was the Sense, the Power, the Deed.* Now *sense* may mean *mind*, understanding; Iago says to Othello (3, 3, 374): *Are you a man? have you a soul or sense?* (Schlegel-Tieck:

Vernunft und Sinn). The term *power* may signify *energy*, and *deed* may denote *power of action*; Milton (*Parad. Lost* 5, 549) says: *Both will and deed created free*. But *the sense, the power, the deed* cannot be understood without a commentary. J. Birch (London, 1839) and Frank Claudy (Washington, 1886) substitute *the Mind* for *the Sense*, which is an improvement, although the article is objectionable. Spinoza speaks of *Deus sive natura*, but there may be a designing mind behind nature. Charles T. Brooks (Boston, 1866) has *the thought, the power, the deed*; but *thought* is less acceptable than *mind*, although it may satisfy the metaphysical idealists (EB¹¹ 1, 75^b) and it might be interpreted as Universal Thought. John Anster (London, 1835) and Bayard Taylor (Boston, 1871) as well as Thos. E. Webb (Dublin, 1880) render: *the Thought, the Power, the Act*. The last term is better than *deed*, but *Action* is preferable. The French translations of Henri Blase (Paris, 1840) and A. de Riedmatten (Paris, 1881) have *l'esprit, la force, l'action* and *l'Intelligence, la Force, l'Action*. The term *Force* is better than *power*. Sir Theodore Martin (London, 1862) gives: *the Sense, the Force, the Deed*. John Stewart Blackie (London, 1880) has *Thought, Force, and the Deed*. The omission of the article before *Thought* and *Force* is a distinct improvement, but we must follow the French translations in substituting *Action* for *deed*, and instead of *thought* we ought to use *Reason*. According to the Stoics, *Reason* (*λόγος*) was the active principle (*ηγεμονικόν*) in the formation of the Universe.² There is a *reason* (*λόγος*) for everything in nature. We find Stoic phraseology not only in the NT, but also in the OT (*Eccl. 2*). Stoicism's most valuable lessons to the world were preserved in Christianity, and its monism was revived by Spinoza (EB¹¹ 25, 943^b, 951^a).

² Cf. EB¹¹ 25, 942^b; 13, 310^a; 24, 375^b; E. Zeller, *Grundriss der Geschichte der griechischen Philosophie* (1905), p. 213 (§ 69) and p. 288 (§ 94). See also GJV⁴ 3, 709. The *λόγος* is not the creative word of God (RE¹¹ 602, 1. 37). For the *word of God* in cuneiform literature cf. KAT¹ 608, 1. 26; Zimmern, *Babylonische Hymnen und Gebete, zweite Auswahl* (Leipsic, 1911), p. 21; also RE¹¹ 601, 1. 18; Delitzsch, *Die grosse Täuschung* (Stuttgart, 1920) p. 75, 1. 11, and *The Presentation of Christianity to Moslems* (published by the Board of Missionary Preparation, New York) pp. 39. 57. 81. 99.

In Schiller's *Jungfrau von Orleans* the dying English general says after the two lines *Unsinn, du siegst, und ich muss untergehn!* | *Mit der Dummheit kämpfen Götter selbst vergebens* (ll. 2320-2322) : *Erhabene Vernunft, lichthelle Tochter | des göttlichen Hauptes, weise Gründerin | des Weltgebäudes, Führerin der Sterne.* According to Bismarck, *mit* in the line *Mit der Dummheit kämpfen Götter selbst vergebens* should be taken to mean *allied to*, not *against*, but this interpretation is, of course, untenable.

Ebeling (MDOG, No. 58, p. 23, n. *) regards *Mummu* in the first fragment of the cuneiform Creation tablets (KAT³ 492, n. 2; cf. AJP 39, 307; OLZ 12, 291) as a personification of Reason (*Logos*). He may combine Assyr. *mummu* with Syr. *háyunā*, reason (*měhauwán*, rational; Heb. *hōn*, wealth, is identical with *ôn*) or with Assyr. *amû*, to speak = Heb. *hamâ*; cf. Arab. *nâtiq*, Syr. *mēlilâ*; also Arab. *uáhama* (JBL 34, 79; 26, 44; ZDMG 61, 295, l. 14; EB 938, n. 4; Mic. 101, b; ZA 17, 356; OLZ 17, 6. 421). See also MVAG 21, 215, l. 2.

The Fourth Gospel (1, 1) identifies Reason (οὐ λόγος) with God (καὶ θεὸς ἦν οὐ λόγος). *All things were made by it* (πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο) and *no man has seen God at any time* (θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πάποτε) : 1, 3. 18; cf. 5, 37 and ZDMG 63, 513, l. 12. The reason why the rendering *Reason* has not been adopted by the theologians (cf. RE³ 11, 600, l. 6) is that Faith and Reason are supposed to be incompatible. The creator of Latin Christian literature is said to have formulated the principle *Credo quia absurdum*.³ Rationalist is not a complimentary term, and the *sacrificium intellectus* is regarded as a most acceptable offering. Even Luther denounced Reason as a *cunning fool* and a *pretty harlot* (EB¹¹ 23, 22^a. 21^b). Positive religion is something more than the intellectual apprehension of the reason in the universe (EB¹¹ 19, 347^b) and the peace of God gives more comfort and strength than any human thinking (VB ad Phil. 4, 7). *Pax Dei, quae corda nostra et intelligentias nostras custodit, exsuperat omnem sensum.*

PAUL HAUPT.

* Tertullian (*De carne Christi* 5) says: *prorsus credibile quia inceptum est.*

VI.—VOCALIC HARMONY IN FOX.¹

On a former occasion (*Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences* 4: 403; 1914) I showed that the Fox *e* and *i* vowels as a whole are more primitive than Ojibwa *i*; I now wish to show that at times the Fox *e* vowel has developed from an *i* vowel by vocalic harmony.

Case 1.

i becomes *e* if the preceding syllable of a different morphological unit contains *e*. This does not apply to terminal *i*.

Examples: i'pa'owag^{kī} "they ran that way," ne'te'pa"^w" "I ran that way"; ä'inä^dtc^ī "then he said to him, her," keten^{ne}" "I said to you," netenä^{wā}" "I said to him, her"; i'ci'tä'ä^{wā}" "he, she thinks," nete'citä"^e" "I think," kete'citä"^e" "you (sing.) think"; inä'nemin^{nu}" "think (sing.) of me," "ketenäneme'-gunän^{na}" "he, she thinks of us (incl.)," netenäne'mäpen^{na}" "we think of you (sing. or pl.)"; i'cawi's^a" "he might do," kete'ca^{wi}" "what are you (sing.) doing?" Very likely nete'kwäm^{ma}" "my sister" (said by male only) is to be explained in the same manner: i'kwä^{wā}" "woman"; for the loss of *w* before the possessive suffix *m*, see *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 1: 50 (1917).

It is evident that the same phonetic shift takes place in Kickapoo: see Jones, *Kickapoo Tales*, 18.16, 18.20, 30.10, 44.14, 106.14. Hence it is to be presumed that the shift also takes place in Sauk, though I have not actual material to prove this. It will be recalled that these three Algonquian dialects are ex-

¹ Printed with permission of the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution. The Fox examples are almost entirely taken from texts dictated by Edward Davenport; some are words obtained from him by direct interrogation; references by page and line are to Jones' Fox Texts. It may be presumed that Sauk and Kickapoo also share all the shifts noted here, though there is not evidence at hand to prove this. It may be added that there are apparently some other laws of vocalic harmony in Fox, but I have not yet definitely succeeded in formulating them. None of these shifts occur when the altering vowel is within the same morphological unit as the *i* normally affected.

tremely closely related. It should be mentioned that although *e* and *i* are extremely difficult to keep apart in many American Indian languages, and often are merely auditory, not real, variants, in Sauk, Fox, and Kickapoo there is not the slightest trouble in distinguishing them.

Case 2.

i becomes *e* if the following syllable of a different morphological unit contains *ä*.

Examples: *tetepi* "circle," *ähanemitetepcäsänitci* "as he whirled over and over in his course," J. 288.15; *tcigike'tcigamīwē* "at the edge of the great sea" [see J. 350.5], *tcigepyägki* "at the edge of the water"; *ämaiayAgigenigl* "it had a queer shape," J. 152.8, *ämaiayagetcänätc* "the touch of her body was strange," J. 326.5; *kī'ci-* [J. *kīci-*] "completion," *inä'katawikkicetäg* "it is almost cooked," J. 372.1; *tcägi* "all," *kätawitcägetäg* "when they (inanimate) were nearly burned up";² *pägigumä'cinwa* "he bumped his nose," *pägetcäcinwa* "he ran and fell flat on his belly." [The last two examples are taken from Jones' grammatical sketch of Fox.] There are evidently some rules cancelling the shift but they are at present unknown: observe *wī'cegänetaMANnēc* "if you keep it firmly in mind" as contrasted with *wī'cigigäpāwā* "he stands firmly," but *mī'cigwäwā* "he has a fuzzy face," *pītigäwā* "he enters," *kī'cipyäwā* "he has come." It is clear that the same shift occurs in Kickapoo: see Jones, Kickapoo Tales, 114. 11, 12, 13. Hence it may be presumed that it also takes place in Sauk though I have not actual evidence to prove this. It seems that the rules cancelling the shift are alike in both Fox and Kickapoo; note Kickapoo *ä'kiskigwawätc* "he cut off her neck," Jones, l. c., 36. 6 and *pītigänu* "come in," ibidem 64. 12.

Case 3.

i becomes *e* if the following syllable of a different morphological unit contains *u*. A medial *g* cancels the shift.

Examples: *wī'cigigäpāwā* "he stands firmly," *ä'wī'cigetu'nämu'dtc* "he spoke strongly"; *upyä'nñi* "slowly," *upyänetu'nämōwā* "he speaks slowly." The contrast between *pägigumä*

² From Jones' Fox Texts; reference misplaced.

cinw^a "he bumped his nose" and pāgetcäcinw^a "he ran and fell flat on his belly" shows that medial *g* cancels the shift. These two examples are taken from Jones.

Case 4.

i becomes *e* if the preceding syllable of a different morphological unit contains *u*.

Examples: i'citä"āgAnⁿⁱ "thought," ute'citä"āgAnⁿⁱ "his, her thought"; i'kwäw^a "woman," ute'kwämAnⁿⁱ "his sister." [For the last two see case 1.]

TRUMAN MICHELSON.

BUREAU OF AMERICAN ETHNOLOGY, WASHINGTON, D. C.

BOOK REVIEWS

Essai sur Persé, par FRANÇOIS VILLENEUVE. Paris: Hachette et Cie., 1918. 540 pp.

The first part of this portly volume deals with the education of Persius, his teachers, his friends, and the social circle in which he moved. This includes a long chapter (56 pp.) on Cornutus and his works. The second part discusses the purpose of his Satires and all their possible models, especially the moral preachings of the Stoics and Cynics. The third and fourth parts are a detailed study of the subjects of the Satires, the development of the thought, and the style. The conclusion of the whole matter is that the poems of Persius are "un essai de transformation de la diatribe en satire horatienne par un stoïcien qui a subi l'action de la rhétorique."

Of the various elements involved in this verdict, the one which is brought out most clearly is, naturally enough, the influence of Horace. This is discussed in detail; and the author not only sets forth the verbal coincidences and similar trains of thought, but examines the causes and significance of this dependence, and studies "the modifications of the language and the thought as they passed through the alembic of Persius's brain." The whole book is well written, and interesting throughout.

Professor VILLENEUVE shows a wide acquaintance with what is politely called the 'literature' of his subject, although he might have paid a little more attention to work done outside of France and Germany. To mention only one or two names, he might have found something of value in the American edition of the Satires by B. L. Gildersleeve (New York: Harper, 1875) or in the Notes on Persius by A. E. Housman in the Classical Quarterly, Jan. 1913—an article which made a most profound impression on the editor of Persius for the Loeb Classical Library. For example, Gildersleeve's commentary would have furnished two interesting verbal parallels: cp. 3, 3, *indomitum . . . despumare Falernum*, with *Lucan*, 10, 162, *indomitum Meroe cogens spumare Falernum*; and 2, 1, *diem numera meliore lapillo*, with *Martial*, 9, 52, 4, *felix utraque lux diesque nobis signandi melioribus lapillis*.

I have made a few marginal notes on the chapters on Persius' language and style.

P. 211 (on 1, 102, *reparabilis . . . echo*). For the 'touch of boldness' of an adjective in -bilis with active meaning, cp. Verg. Geor. 1, 93, *penetrabile frigus*; Aen. 10, 481, *penetrabile telum*; Lucr. 1, 11, *genitabilis aura Favoni*.

P. 398 (on 1, 42, faxit oletum). The expression is quoted from Veranius: *Sacerdotula in sacrario Martiali fecit oletum*. See Festus, Paul. p. 221 (Lindsay).

P. 407 (on 2, 28, idcirco). This 'prosaic' word occurs three times in Vergil: Geor. 1, 231; 3, 445; Aen. 5, 680.

P. 417 (on 2, 31, metuens divum). Cp. Lucre. 3, 982, divom metus . . . inanis; Livy, 22, 3, 4, deorum . . . metuens.

P. 418 (on 3, 7, ocius adsit hue aliquis). Cp. Verg. Ecl. 7, 8, ocius, inquit, hue ades.

P. 419 (on 3, 3, quod despumare . . . sufficiat). For sufficere with the infinitive, cp. Verg. Aen. 5, 22, nec tendere tantum sufficimus; Calpurn. Ecl. 7, 35, quod vix suffecimus ipsi per partes spectare suas.

P. 421 (on 3, 10, positis . . . capillis). Cp. Calpurn. Ecl. 5, 72, cum vacuas posito velamine costas denudabit ovis; Martial, 7, 29, 3, sic etiam positis formosus amere capillis.

P. 434 (on 3, 86, his populus ridet). 'His' is probably an ablative. Cp. Hor. Sat. 2, 8, 83, ridetur fictis rerum.

P. 442 (on 4, 7, fecisse silentia). Cp. Calpurn. Ecl. 2, 17, altaque per totos fecere silentia montes; Ovid, M. 9, 692, qui que premit vocem digitoque silentia suadet.

P. 468 (on 5, 60, transisse dies). Cp. Tibullus, 1, 4, 27, transiet aetas; Pliny, N. H. 18, 267, transisse solstitium caveto putes; Martial, 2, 64, 3, transit et Nestoris aetas; 5, 84, 6, Saturnalia transiere tota.

P. 474 (on 5, 95, caloni . . . alto). The use of altus of a tall man is apparently not confined to Epic. The Thesaurus cites Columella, 1, 9, 3, non sic altos quemadmodum latos et lacertosos viros.

P. 492 (on 6, 31, costa ratis). For the metaphor, cp. Ovid, Ep. 15, 112, texitur et costis panda carina suis. It is interesting to notice that Professor Arthur Palmer assigned this epistle (Paris to Helen) to "about the epoch of Persius or Petronius."

On p. 149, l. 17, the reference to Horace should read, "the eighth satire of the first book," not the "third."

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

WILFRED P. MUSTARD.

C. Suetonii Tranquilli De Vita Caesarum Liber VIII: *Divus Titus*. An edition with parallel passages and notes. By HELEN PRICE. Banta Publishing Co., Menasha, Wis., 1919. 85 pp.

This is a thesis recently presented at the University of Pennsylvania for the degree of Ph. D. The 'parallel passages' illustrate or confirm the various statements of Suetonius; they are

drawn from Pliny, Tacitus, Plutarch, Dio, Josephus, Philostratus, and the rest. The notes are carefully written, and show a certain independence of judgment. One obscure passage still remains obscure. At 8, 4 the text is given as "Urbis incendio nihil publice nisi perisse testatus," and the translation adopted is "During the fire at Rome he made no remark except, 'I am ruined.'" This seems to take very little account of the word 'publice.' By a pleasant coincidence a similar study of Suetonius' Life of Domitian was presented in the same year as a doctor's thesis at the University of Amsterdam. The author is JAN JANSSEN; the publisher, J. B. Wolters, Groningen.

W. P. MUSTARD.

Corpus scriptorum latinorum Paravianum. Moderante Carolo Pascal, *In aedibus Io. Bapt. Paraviae et Soc.*, Aug. Taurinorum.

Q. VALERII CATULLI CARMINA. Recensuit, praefatus est, appendicem criticam addidit CAROLUS PASCAL. 2.25 lire.

CORNELII TACITI DE VITA AGRICOLAE LIBER. Recensuit, praefatus est, appendice critica instruxit C. ANNIBALDI. Accedunt de Cornelio Tacito testimonia vetera a CAROLO PASCAL conlecta. 1.25 lire.

[**P. VERGILII MARONIS**] **CATALEPTON (PRIAPEA ET EPIGRAMMATA), MAECENAS, PRIAPEUM "QUID HOC NOVI EST."** Recensuit, praefatus est, appendicem criticam et indicem verborum addidit REM. SABBADINI. 4 lire.

During the war the distinguished house of Paravia entered upon an extensive plan of issuing a new edition of the Latin Classics to be called the *Corpus scriptorum latinorum Paravianum*. Carlo Pascal, the energetic professor of Pavia, assumed the general editorship and quickly secured the services of many of the best Italian scholars. The books are now being rapidly issued in thin and inexpensive editions bound in light board. Each contains a modest critical apparatus with a brief account of the manuscripts; at times a convenient list of testimonia or a word-index is added. In fact, the edition was designed to meet practically the same needs as are served by the Teubner texts.

More than twenty volumes have now appeared in pamphlets containing an average of one hundred pages. Pascal has himself edited Catullus, Cicero's *De Republica*, Vergil's *Bucolics*, and Plautus' *Captivi*. Of the other editions scholars will be particularly interested in the *Germania* and the *Agricola* (ed.

Annibaldi), the *Dialogus* (Wick), the *Aeneid* in four volumes and the *Catalepton* (Sabbadini), Plautus' *Miles* (Zuretti), and Seneca's *De Ira* (Barriera).

Excellent taste is evident in the type, as was to be expected in an Italian text. That the paper is poor cannot be criticized in these days. "Dopo la guerra" new impressions can and doubtless will be made on firmer texture. The earlier volumes were generally sold at two lire or less. That the price has doubled on recent volumes need, perhaps, not be taken as an augury of the future.

I shall here take space to notice only three volumes that seem to be typical of the series. Pascal's *CATULLUS*, the first volume issued in the series, presents a fairly conservative and well considered text. His own proposal, however, of probissime (29, 23) and salopugium (53, 5) will probably not win approval; the reversion to Statius' illac atque alia (64, 16) despite Vahlen, the adoption of Quintus as the poet's praenomen, and the acceptance from D of the dull line inserted after 65, 8 give an indication of occasional fallibility.

To the reviewer the critical apparatus is disappointing since it does not provide a new and independent collation of R, which of course was accessible. This manuscript may perhaps not supply many new readings of value, but a study of it will at least prove it the ultimate source of a large group of Italian manuscripts (see Class. Phil. 1908, p. 234). Its real value, therefore, lies in its power to jettison once and for all the conjectures of M, B, D, A, C and the rest of the emended group. At least a half of the apparatus of Ellis, Friedrich, and Pascal might then be thrown overboard, and the space conserved for a fuller collation of the three best MSS. Pascal apparently accepted the readings of R from Ellis, whose collation of it was far from reliable. His text, therefore, though it will appeal to many as the best now in existence, is disappointing because the final work is still left undone.

The *AGRICOLA* was naturally assigned to Annibaldi who discovered the Jesi manuscript. In the preface he states that he would not depart from its readings nisi cum necessitas cogeret. It must not be thought, however, that he is oversanguine about its value. Indeed many scholars would have found its evidence more compelling than has Annibaldi. So, for instance, nonanis 26, 10 may well stand; in 38, 27 the text of E gives good sense without any drastic alterations, and in 20, 9 Gudeman's incitamenta is paleographically somewhat closer to E's irritamenta than is invitamenta adopted from Halm.

Sabbadini, who issued a good edition of the *Catalepton* in 1903, when very few scholars considered them worthy of attention, has edited the slim volume devoted to [P. VERGILII MARONIS] *CATALEPTON, MAECENAS, PRIAPEUM* "QUID HOC NOVI

EST," which happen to be found together in the Brussels manuscript. He wisely adds a few explanatory notes in the appendix, some of which, especially on nos. 12 and 13, provide new suggestions of value. For Cat. I he adopts Birt's now unquestioned interpretation, but in VII he rejects Birt's equally convincing reading in favor of pōtus on the assumption that Vergil had permitted himself a lapse in quantity. He still clings to the tradition that III refers to Alexander, that IX was written for Messala's triumph in 27 b. c., and that XIV was composed in the days of the poet's maturest work. On the title-page Vergil's name appears in brackets, which seems to imply that the Catalepton have no more claim to authenticity than the Maecenas. In this connection we may mention that in another volume of the series Pascal edits the Moretum and the Copa, *falso Virgilio adtributa*, with the Bucolics. This peculiar method of scattering the poems of the appendix in several volumes seems especially unfortunate now when they are being so widely discussed. The grouping should be determined by the classical tradition of what was Vergilian, not by the accidents and humors of medieval scribes.

In general, the Corpus promises to be of great service even to American scholars, though it is primarily intended for the use of students in the Italian licei. The various volumes are so limited in content that they will probably not displace the Oxford texts in our upper college classes, but they, each and all, contain scientific contributions which the careful student cannot disregard with impunity. Certainly the classicists of Italy are heartily to be congratulated on this new proof of their courage in times of deep distress, and especially of their thoroughly grounded scholarship.

TENNEY FRANK.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

Life and Stories of the Jaina Savior Pārçvanātha. By MAURICE BLOOMFIELD. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1919. 266 pages, 8°. Cloth, \$3.00.

The Jains have been less exploited than the Buddhists. They are a harmless sect that once spread out from northern India and had considerable influence there and even in the south, though their rather colorless tenets could not in the end make headway against the more robust deism that delights the Hindu mind. Their literature is lacking also in that personal charm which in the case of Buddhism radiates from the magnetic personality of the master. Even the historical founder of the Jain religion is not attractive, possibly because he is not really historical. But the Jains, who lived on saintship rather than on divinity, were

not content with one founder ; they invented a number of founders, each a little more remote than the last, and fed themselves religiously with the staff of life to be extracted from such sustenance as tales of moral character supposed to be in line with the teaching of the supposed pre-founder. Of course this resulted historically in nothing more than a cycle of stories, gradually revolving about a fanciful figure, the figure itself, as conceived by tradition, being as great a figment of the imagination as its environment of rather dull 'histories.' Such a collection has gathered about the name of the figure called Pārvanātha, believed by Jains to be the pre-founder or pre-savior ; for all these Jain saints are known as saviors when they have "prepared the way" for salvation, or in the native idiom have "made a ford" for others to cross the stream of life to safety. They are not saviors in the Christian sense, only as making it possible for others to cross the stream of life to safety. This Pārvanātha is imagined as a real "ford-maker" who lived in the eighth century B. C. and it is not impossible that he actually existed. Miracles in approved style, not necessarily copied from Buddhism but based on the notion of *comme il faut*, accompanied his birth ; angels acclaimed him, as dreams had prophesied him to be the coming light of the world ; the gods sang a hymn to his queen-mother and garlanded the infant prodigy already recognized as an Arhat (Saint). A serpent seen by his mother in a dream provided occasion for the savior's name ; the snake was by her side, *pārśva*, hence he was called Side, Pārśva (*nātha* is savior). It is only fair to the Jains to say that they were probably not responsible for the exhilarating name, which occurs as a name even among the Buddhists. The Jains remembered a saint Side and then invented a reason for the name. A princess called Beautiful heard the praises of Side sung, after he was grown up, and fell in love with him because of the song, without having seen him, which is not uncommon in Brittany as well as in India. Rivalry on the part of another aspirant produced some difficulty, happily overcome by Pārśva who, however, after he had saved the girl and her father, announced that he preferred salvation to marriage and at first declined her hand. But afterwards he decided to marry first and get salvation afterwards. Ultimately he renounced the world and preached the law of righteousness that others might be saved. His first sermon, for example, inculcated charity, virtue, asceticism, and character. He illustrated by stories the meaning of each term used in its various applications, charity, for example, being defined as the giving of knowledge, or of security, or of religious support (by gifts to Jain beggars). The illustrative tales are usually fables of antiquity warped to a religious purpose and attached to Pārśva's name. They are told at length and are as inspiring as moral tales and relics of saints usually are. Some of

them repeat old material familiar to us from Buddhist sources. The main story of the pre-founder's life thus jogs slowly along with excursions of tales in every direction. Emboxed tales of the sort are no novelty; they are typical of the East. Besides Pārśva's sermons there are also those of his disciple Āryadatta, boxed in the same way. The narrative needs a thread of guidance in such tales, since one finds it difficult to remember where the main narrative has been forsaken for an excursus. Professor Bloomfield, in the present volume, has taken one version of the Pārśva cycle and by clear headings and sub-divisions made it easy to follow the drift of the tale and the various by-paths of sub-tales. He has not translated the original but given a *résumé* of it, that is of the Life of Pārśva by Bhāvadeva, a late author who wrote in the somewhat corrupt Sanskrit of his time and sect. The Life also includes lives lived before the last earthly existence. The real value of the book is not historical, but the large number of fables and moral tales adds not a little to our knowledge of Hindu fiction. The lexicographical material is valuable and has been carefully arranged in an appendix. For example, a new *-bha* word is *jalabha*; *gophanī* is a kind of cannon; *sthagati* is noticeable; as is the injunctive *ā-tathās* (from *tan*). Sanskrit scholars will find much more that is interesting in Appendix II and those who like proverbs will find an assortment of them in Appendix I. The book as a whole contains "The first complete account of Pārśvanātha published to the Western world," as the preface says, and as such is a welcome addition to the Jain literature available to students of religions.

E. W. HOPKINS.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

Publications of the American Ethnological Society, edited by Franz Boas. Vol. VII, Pt. I. WILLIAM JONES, Ojibwa Texts. Edited by TRUMAN MICHELSON. 1917. xxi + 501 pp. Pt. II. 1919. x + 777 pp.; 2 plates.

In the case of the translation of an American language into a European one, all that can be expected is a correct conveying of the general sense of the narratives. A precise translation into English of a language which does not have sex gender but does possess a gender which distinguishes the *animate* from the *inanimate* is out of the question. And gender is but one of the many difficulties. The translations given are entirely adequate for the comprehension of the context of the Ojibwa narratives. From this context much of the structure of the language has to be determined. Such a large body of text, for instance, should

furnish material to determine under what circumstances the animate gender is used. The task remains for someone to compile from these texts a dictionary and a grammar more ample and precise than those now in existence.

These volumes are examples of the sort of coöperation which ought to exist more generally. First should be mentioned the author, Dr. WILLIAM JONES, in blood one-quarter Indian, in early rearing totally Indian, in education an alumnus of Harvard and Columbia. He brought to his work native ability, deep interest, and a splendid preparation. Unfortunately he was killed by natives in the Philippine Islands in March, 1909, before the material composing these two volumes was prepared for the printer.

There should be mentioned also those Ojibwa Indians who having learned these myths and tales from others dictated them for this permanent record. The narratives themselves are of unknown composition but their particular literary form depends in some part upon the individual narrator.

The preparation of the manuscript for the printer and the prolonged and arduous labor of carrying these two volumes through the press fell upon Dr. TRUMAN MICHELSON whose knowledge of Algonkian languages particularly fitted him for this work. Such unselfish labor deserves great credit.

The field work involved was provided for by the Carnegie Institution, which contributed largely to the expense of printing the volumes. It should be added in conclusion that the opportunity for Dr. Jones to do the field work, the rescuing of the manuscripts after Dr. Jones' death, the establishment of the series in which the volumes appear, and the arrangement for their being issued are due to Professor Franz Boas and his great and prolonged interest in the scientific work of Dr. William Jones.

P. E. GODDARD.

AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY.

REPORTS.

RIVISTA DI FILOLOGIA, Vol. XLVIII (1919).

Pp. 1-4. This volume of the Rivista is dedicated to the President and people of the United States, in grateful recognition of services rendered to Italy during the Great War.

Pp. 5-26. Giuseppe Fraccaroli. An appreciative review of a distinguished scholar's work, especially on Pindar, Aeschylus and Plato. By C. O. Zuretti.

Pp. 27-33. Divagazioni sul ritmo oratorio. R. Sabbadini. The writer infers from a passage of Claudius Sacerdos (G. L. VI 493 K) that accentual rhythm (in prose) was taught and practised in the third century, side by side with the teaching of quantitative rhythm.

P. 34. Un indovinello anagrammatico. R. Sabbadini. A note on the famous puzzle *Sator arepo tenet*, etc. The writer tamely substitutes *opera* for *arepo*, and *sator* for *rotas*, thus reducing the possible meaning to a single phrase of three words, *sator opera tenet* or *tenet opera sator*.

Pp. 35-41. Incerti poetae Octavia. Luigi Valmaggi. A recent edition of the Octavia (by A. Santoro, 1918) argues for a late date of composition, as late as the third century. Valmaggi examines the arguments offered, but finds no reason for thinking that it was written later than the time of Vespasian.

Pp. 42-53. Sopra la prima bucolica di Virgilio. Giacomo Giri. Tityrus is not Vergil, or Vergil's vilicus, but an imaginary person, now the owner of a bit of land which he formerly held as a slave. He is really a less important character in the Eclogue than Meliboeus. Apparently the poet's chief purpose was to emphasize not so much the good fortune of Tityrus as the distress of his less fortunate neighbors.

Pp. 54-75. Le opere spurie di Epicarmo e l'Epicharmus di Ennio. Carlo Pascal. Speculation as to the Pseudepicharmeia mentioned by Athenaeus (XIV 648 D) and some of the fragments of Ennius.

Pp. 76-80. Demetrio Triclinio e gli scolii a Teocrito. Francesco Garin. Triclinius used only a single codex, of the Genus Vaticanum. The scholia which he gives under his own name are for the most part a compilation of earlier notes (especially on Idylls 1-8), with a few additional notes, explanatory, etymo-

logical or grammatical, on lines on which he found no commentary.

Pp. 81-95. Erennio Modestino. Giovanni Pesenti prints the text of the Periodiae of Vergil as given in Codex Monacensis Lat. 807 (M). These are ascribed to Herennius Modestinus, or 'Modestinus iurisconsultus.' They were perhaps written by Modestinus the tutor of the young Maximinus (emperor 235-8).

Pp. 96-134. Reviews and notices of new books: A. C. Clark, *The Descent of Manuscripts*; Walter Dennison, *A Gold Treasure of the Late Roman Period*; W. A. Merrill, *Lucreti de Rerum Natura libri sex*; Clifford H. Moore, *Pagan Ideas of Immortality during the Early Empire*; Henry A. Sanders, *The Washington Manuscript of the Psalms*; etc.

Pp. 135-160. Reports of periodicals and list of books received.

P. 160. Obituary notice of Benedetto Soldati (d. Dec. 26, 1918), editor of the *Carmina of Pontano*.

Pp. 161-215. *Osservazioni sulla terza guerra Sannitica*. Vincenzo Costanzi. A study of the situation of Rome immediately after the Second Samnite War, the relations between Lucania and Rome before the Third War, the behavior of the Lucanians at the time of the Third War, the part played by the 'Samnites' and the 'Sabines,' the military action of the years 297-296, the Etruscans in the Third Samnite War. There is an appendix on the expedition of Cleonymus and the location of Thuriae (Livy, x 2). Thuriae was probably south of Brundisium.

Pp. 216-222. *Preteso oblio della quantità nei grammatici latini*. Enrico Cocchia. On p. 31 of this volume R. Sabbadini reports the grammarian M. Plotius Sacerdos as regarding Cicero's clausula *perspicere possit* as the close of a hexameter verse. This is based on a misinterpretation of Sacerdos' words (VI 493, K.).

Pp. 223-240. *Tibulliana*. F. Calonghi. Some readings reported from a recent examination of the Codex Ambrosianus.

Pp. 241-248. *Theocritea*. Francesco Garin. Notes on Id. II 33-4; II 106; XIII 14; XIII 61-3; XV 77; XV 79; XV 100-1. In II 106 the best manuscripts have *ἐν δὲ μετώπῳ* not *ἐκ δὲ*. That is, beads of perspiration stood out on her forehead. In XIII 15 *αὐτῷ* may be a genitive; cp. the Italian expression 'ritrae dal padre,' of a son who is like his father. XIII 61 should be omitted. In XV 77 *ἀποκλάξας* means that the bridegroom shuts in (*κλείει*) the bride, separating her (*ἀπὸ*) from her girl friends.

Pp. 249-259. Note su Pausania. Tito Tosi. Notes on I 22, 6; II 16, 6-7; IV 5, 6 (read Ἀνδροκλέους μὲν ἐκδιδόναι Πολυχάρην ὡς ἀνόσια τε <καὶ δεινὰ> καὶ πέρα δεινῶν εἰργασμένον); VIII 24, 4; X 26, 4.

Pp. 260-270. Particolarità della costruzione del *nominativus cum infinitivo*. A. Gandiglio.

Pp. 271-273. M. Minucio Felice Oct. 14, 1. Arnaldo Beltrami. "Homo Plautinae prosapiae" = homo caninae prosapiae = unus de grege advocatorum vel causarum patronorum (cp. Festus, pp. 259, 84 Lindsay). "Pistorum praecipiuus" = advocatorum vel causarum patronorum praecipiuus.

Pp. 274-277. Note all' *Elettra* di Euripide. Giuseppe Ammendola. Discussion of lines 95, 164-65, 251, 641.

Pp. 277-278. Nota a Sofocle. Giuseppe Ammendola. Discussion of Philoctetes, 830-31. The chorus prays that sleep "scenda in mezzo alla luce serena diffusa nell' aria e si posi sugli occhi dell' eroe infelice."

Pp. 279-298. Reviews and notices of new books.

Pp. 299-316. Reports of classical journals.

P. 320. Notice of the death of Professor Pietro Rasi of the University of Padua (Apr. 2, 1919).

Pp. 321-326. Le novissime dubitazioni contro la etruscità delle due iscrizioni preelleniche di Lemno. Elia Lattes. A reply to L. Paret's article, Rivista, XLVI 153 ff.

Pp. 327-337. Studi sull' accento greco e latino. *Accentus mater musices*. M. Lenchantin De Gubernatis. In ancient singing, as in modern, the normal prose accent of a word was sometimes transposed.

Pp. 338-347. Il testo interpolato del Ludus di Seneca. Remigio Sabbadini. The first edition of the Ludus was published at Rome in 1513. The name of the editor, C. Sylvanus (Germanicus), is an Academic pseudonym; he belonged to the circle founded at Rome by his countryman Goritz ('Corycius'). His interpolations are taken mainly from Suetonius and Juvenal. [Sabbadini says that only two copies of the editio princeps are known, one in the Vatican and one at Munich. A. P. Ball, in his edition of the Ludus, New York, 1902, described a third copy, in the library of Columbia University. And in his commentary he indicated the source of each of Sylvanus' interpolations.] The first three editions by Beatus Rhenanus merely reproduce the text of the editio princeps. In his fourth edition, 1529, he was able to make some use of the Codex Wissenburgensis. [In Rhenanus' commentary on the Ludus, 1515, he

twice cites Velleius Paterculus, whom he had just discovered that year. These citations confirm Robinson Ellis's argument that the copy of the Murbach MS. written by Boniface Amerbach, Aug. 1516, is not the copy made for Rhenanus by his 'amicus quidam.]

Pp. 348-350. *Tener vaccula.* M. Lenchantin De Gubernatis. In the Vergilian Catalepton, 2, 14, teneraque matre mugiente vaccula, it might be well to revive the conjecture of Muretus, tenerque . . . vaccula, and call 'tener' a feminine, like 'pauper.'

Pp. 351-357. *Le avventure di Leucippo e Clitofonte nel papiro di Oxyrhynchos 1250.* Francesco Garin. A papyrus of the beginning of the fourth century has preserved a long passage of the second book of Achilles Tatius. This shows a striking variation from the text of the mediaeval manuscripts: chapters II and III of the manuscript text are here inserted between chapters VIII and IX. This gives the narrative in a better order. The new fragment is of considerable importance for constituting the text. It helps to fix the date of Achilles Tatius: about 250, certainly not later than 300.

Pp. 358-365. *Della relazione che intercede secondo Fozio tra Lucio di Patrae e Luciano.* Enrico Cocchia. A defence of views set forth in the writer's study of Apuleius, 1915 (A. J. P. XXXVIII 317).

Pp. 366-380. *Clemente Alessandrino nell' Ottavio di Minucio Felice.* Arnaldo Beltrami. The first instalment of an attempt to show that Minucius knew and used the writings of Clement of Alexandria.

Pp. 381-387. *Nota Virgiliana.* Gino Funaioli. The first line of the sixth Eclogue, *Prima Syracosio dignata est ludere versu*, means, 'My muse was the first to sing,' etc., not 'At first, my Muse,' etc.

Pp. 388-393. *Note critiche ed ermeneutiche ad Aurelius Victor.* Francesco Stabile. Notes on 1, 6; 3, 1; 3, 3; 3, 7; 3, 8; 8, 2; 12, 1; 17, 7; 20, 27; 24, 10; 37, 7; 39, 11; 39, 26.

Pp. 394-397. *Etimologia di vinolentus.* Francesco Stabile. Defends the old etymology, from *vinum* with the suffix *lentus*, against a recent derivation from *vinum* and *olere*.

Pp. 398-413. *Proteo e Cirene nella favola Virgiliana di Aristeo.* Giacomo Giri. The information given to Aristaeus by Proteus and by Cyrene is the information which it was appropriate for each of them to give.

Pp. 414-422. *Philodemea.* Ettore Bignone. A study of Pap. Herc. ined. 168; Pap. Herc. 57.

Pp. 423-433. Nuove ricerche sul proemio del poema di Lucrezio. Ettore Bignone. Lines 44-49 of the first book, 'omnis enim per se divum natura,' etc., are probably not an interpolation, and should be kept in the text. The lacuna should be indicated just before them, not after them.

Pp. 434-438. Teocrito nel papiro di Ossirinco 1618. Francesco Garin. This papyrus is of very little value for the text.

P. 439. In Leonardum Vincium. E. Stampini. A Latin epigram written for the fourth centenary of the artist's death.

Pp. 440-444. Pietro Rasi. A sympathetic sketch of Rasi's life and work, by M. Lenchantin De Gubernatis.

Pp. 445-490. Reviews and notices of new books: The *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part XIII (a detailed report by C. O. Zuretti); R. Sabbadini, [P. Vergili Maronis] *Catalepton*; some pleasant comments on the Hoeufft prize poems of 1917 and 1918; Concetto Marchesi, *Le Corone di Prudenzio tradotte e illustrate*; Emilio Costa, *Cicerone giureconsulto*, Parte IV; etc.

Pp. 491-506. Reports of classical periodicals.

Pp. 507-512. List of new books received.

W. P. MUSTARD.

REVUE DE PHILOGIE, Vol. XLIII (1919), pts. 1, 2.

Pp. 5-20. Notes de critique verbale sur Scribonius Largus (continued from Vol. XLII). Paul Jourdan. The general conclusion of this long article seems to be that the text of Scribonius is too uncertain for any profitable study of his Latinity.

Pp. 21-34. Eudoxe de Cnide et l'Egypte, contribution à l'étude du syncrétisme gréco-égyptien. Georges Méautis. A study of two passages of Plutarch, *De Isid. et Osir.*, c. 6 and c. 64. These passages indicate that Eudoxus paid some attention to the assimilation of the gods of Egypt and Greece, but did not accept all the identifications which were generally proposed. The first passage suggests that he reported as Egyptian some theories and conceptions which may properly be called Orphic.

P. 35. Rhétorique à Hérennius, IV, xxii, 31. L. Bayard. In the statement "Alexandro si vita data longior esset, trans Oceanum . . . Macedonum transvolasset," the lacuna might be filled by the word "nomen."

Pp. 36-46. Deux papyrus des 'Pubblicazioni della Società italiana.' Paul Collart. No. 149 is an epic fragment from some

poet of the school of Nonnus. No. 156 is a fragment of a Life of Aesop.

P. 46. Thucydide II 65, 12. L. Bayard. The MS. reading *τρία μὲν ἔτη* may very well be retained. The period during which Athens had to contend against so many enemies at once lasted three years—from 407, when Cyrus joined in the war, to the capitulation of the city in 404.

Pp. 47-62. Les papyrus d'Oxyrhynchos, à propos de tome XIII. Paul Collart. Discussion (with translations) of the new Oxyrhynchus fragments of Lysias, of Hyperides' (?) For Lycophron, and of the dialogue Alcibiades of Aeschines the Socratic. Pap. 1622 gives a new reading of Thucydides, II 67, 3. Here the MSS. have *τὸ πλοῖον φέμελλον τὸν Ἐλλήσποντον περιώσειν*. The papyrus has *τὸ πλοῖον ἔμελλε, κ. τ. λ.* Collart proposes a 'contamination' of the two texts: *φέμελλε . . . , the vessel on which he was to send them across.*'

Pp. 63-65. *Color deterrimus* (Virgile, Géorgiques, III 82). J. S. Phillimore. For 'color deterrimus albis | et gilvo' read 'albis | e gilvo,' i. e., 'cream-coloured.'

Pp. 66-77. Notes sur *l'Electre* de Sophocle. L. Parmentier. In line 363 *μόνον* is an adverb, not an adjective, and *βόσκημα* is the subject of *μὴ λυπεῖν ἐμέ*—“Quant à moi, qu'il me suffise que ce que je mange ne me répugne pas.” At 775 ff. translate: “lui qui, né de ma propre vie, a déserté mon sein et a fui ma tutelle, pour vivre à l'étranger.” Notes on 1220, 1312-3, 1344, 1466-7.

Pp. 78-85. Un mythe pythagoricien chez Posidonius et Philon. Franz Cumont. A comment on a passage of Philo of Alexandria, De Plant. Noe, 28, § 117 ff. This passage shows the influence of the Stoic teachings of Posidonius.

Pp. 86-92. Hypothèses critiques sur les *Pensées* de Marc-Aurèle. A.-I. Trannoy. Textual conjectures on I 16, 17; II 17, 1; III 11, 2; III 12, 1; IV 27; V 4; V 7; V 15 1; V 23, 3; VI 13, 1; VI 38; VII 9, 1; VII 24; VII 58, 3; VIII 5; VIII 30-31; VIII 35; IX 10, 3; IX 28, 2; X 6, 1; X 11, 2; X 15; X 38; XI 18, 8; XII 1, 5; XII 10-11; XII 17-18.

Pp. 93-96. Bulletin bibliographique. Reviews of Louis Luard's *Manuel des Études grecques et latines*, fasc. IV-VI, and of Lane Cooper's *Concordance to the Works of Horace*.

Pp. 97-174. Sur le texte de l'*Odyssée*. Victor Bérard. At IV 208 for *γεινομένῳ* read *γειναμένῳ*—“heureux en son épouse, heureux en ses enfants.” At VIII 136 read *αὐχένα τε στιβαρὸν στῆθός τε μέγ' οὐδέ τι γῆβης*. At XIII 295 read *φίλοι οἵ τοι παιδόθεν εἰσίν*. At II 87 read *σοὶ δ' ἀχένων οὐ τι μηνστῆρές γ' αἴτιοί εἰσιν*. At XXII 143 read *εἰς θάλαμον Ὀδυσῆος*. At XIII 246 for

Βούβοτος read *σύβοτος*. At III 260 read *κείμενον* ἐν πεδίῳ ἐκ δότεος. At XVI 165 for *μεγάροι* read *σταθμοῖ*. At IV 758 for γέον read δδύνας. III 19-20, III 98-101, IV 322-27, are interpolations. At VI 303 for ἡρως or ἡρως read ἔρεσθ'. At XXIII 24 read αὐτ' ἔξω μεγάρων. At IX 302 for θυμός read μῆθος. At X 528 for *eis Ἐρεβος* read *eis βόθρον*. At II 148 read τὸ δ' ιθὺς ρὰ πέτοντο, ορ τὸ δὲ θοῶς ρὰ πέτοντο. At II 168 read φραζόμεθ' ὃς κέν σφεας καταπαύσομεν. At XXII 446 for ἀλλέες read ἀναιδέες. At VIII 499 for φαινε read ὄφαινε. At X 554 for ἐν δώμασι read ἐπὶ δώμασι. At VII 321 for πολλόν read πολύ. At I 436 read ώιξ' ὁ γε θύρας.

Pp. 175-226. Inscriptions de Didymes, Classement chronologique des comptes de la construction du Didymeion. Bernard Haussoullier. Text (with discussion) of important inscriptions discovered at Miletus in 1903 and 1904.

Pp. 227-240. Bulletin bibliographique. Reviews of E. H. Sturtevant's Linguistic Change; W. Warde Fowler's Aeneas at the Site of Rome; Charles Favez' edition of Seneca's Consolatio ad Helviam; François Villeneuve's Essai sur Perse; Max Niedermann's Essais d'étymologie et de critique verbale latines, etc.

Revue des revues et publications d'Académies relatives à l'antiquité classique, Fascicules publiés en 1918, pages 1-32.

W. P. MUSTARD.

BRIEF MENTION.

My theory of the sonnet, or, to be precise, of that form of sonnet to which I am addicted, is of the same order as my view of the structure of Pindar's triadic odes. That analysis was pronounced masterly by scholars who were not favourably impressed by my Pindaric studies. But what is considered masterly in one generation is often held in the next to be the work of an idle dreamer or the poor result of imperfect induction.

Just as I looked upon each triadic poem as one great stanza, the several triads forming, as it were, verses within the whole, and thus yielding such proportions as are to be expected in verses, so I look upon the sonnet, and its parts. To me, it repeats the movement of the elegiac distich; the octave representing the hexameter, the sextet, the so-called pentameter, of the elegiac distich. Ovid says,

Par erat inferior versus; risisse Cupido
Dicitur atque unum surripuisse pedem.

Critic after critic has pronounced Ovid to be no poet, but merely a rhetorician; but for that matter, the same thing has been said of Byron, and I am disposed to stand up for Kirby Smith's favourite and, at one time, my own. At all events, he has illuminated the ages with that 'rethoryke sweete.' His fancies, it is true, are often merely conceits, as in those famous verses in which he represents the Nile as having hidden his head at the conflagration caused by the misadventure of Phaethon and having kept it hidden since. In like manner, with the best will in the world, one cannot applaud his interpretation of the significance of the elegiac distich. This figure shows only too plainly that the deft verse-wright who established by his practice the tyrannis of the iambic close of the pentameter followed the five-foot rule of the metricians to the effacement of origin and symbolism of the elegiac distich as understood by the rhythmist (A. J. P. XXIX 371). This long syllable, which is not only long but prolonged, gives a lyric character to the verse and recalls the process by which the heroic hexameter came into being. In that prolonged note we hear the trumpet-call of the warrior, the wail of the mourner, the yearning cry of the lover. The elegiac distich was not too good for every-day life and it went forth conquering and to conquer the domain of inscriptive verse. The spirit of mockery availed itself of the form wherewith to scoff, to jeer, to flout, and the protracted final

syllable was not a solemn laying on of hands, a wail, a sigh, but resembled rather the thrust of a long skewer into the rearward of an adversary. It is this function of the antique epigram that has been preserved in its modern equivalents, whereas the sonnet, the true *analogon*, gives less scope to satire. With this conception of the elegiac distich, it will not be surprising that I should look upon the modern sonnet as an *analogon* on a large scale. The octave, as I have just said, represents the hexameter, the sextet, the pentameter, and the likeness to the latter is heightened by the use of the terza rima. To push the analogy farther and show the correspondences in the offices of the several parts, would require a long disquisition. One thing, however, I may mention. The Greeks kept prose and poetry steadily apart—exceptions, as in the case of Ion, are extremely rare—but the elegiac distich was open to all; and I may claim Hellenic authority for introducing my sonnets into the company of grave grammarians. If that chifffonier Diogenes Laertius might try his hand on epigram, why not I try mine on sonnets?

Whatever may be thought of the theory of the sonnet, in my practice I have been frankly rhetorical, and the structure is as simple as that of the fable, for which to be sure, the elegiac metre does not at first seem to be well adapted, though it has been so employed by Socrates, if the fragment is genuine, and by Avianus.

Maupassant's *Une Vie*, which once read never lets one go, opens with a picture of an old couple, who despite sundry episodes have been brought by a long life in common into a closer union. It is a commentary on the familiar theme, *consuetudo concinnat amorem*. The prolonged communion of an editor with his author may well be compared to a marriage in which the party of the first part may be constrained to echo Laurence Sterne's confession in his Latin epistle to Hall-Stevenson, *sum fatigatus et aegrotus de meâ uxore*, but, in the old times at least, the long familiarity bred a certain liking that is perhaps more desirable than what passes for love. Still, we live in a restless age, an age of easy divorce, for which incompatibility is often the principal reason, and I have had occasion to notice in the AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY indications of dissatisfaction with Pindar on the part of those who outwardly at least are in close relations with him. Occasional quarrels may be set down to the *amantium irae*, and such tiffs are familiar to the student of Pindar. So, for instance, Bergk vilipends the Ninth Pythian which happens to be an especial favourite of mine. But we have all emancipated ourselves from German aesthetics.

Wilamowitz and Schroeder have committed themselves to judgments which are as harsh as those of Mahaffy, and Murray.

And the other day my attention was called by a true lover and knower of Pindar to a cry of despair¹ uttered by one who is accounted among the leading German poets. It is couched in the measure regularly employed by the Greek epigrammatists, and, in further illustration of the theory that the modern sonnet corresponds to the Greek epigram, I have not translated it but transposed it into that form:

Can Pindar's lay be made to live again,
Which in Olympia once the Hellenes stirred?
His words of wisdom deep may still be heard,
And traces of his upward flight remain.

We have an inkling of the rhythmic strain,
Which bore aloft each many-storied word.
To hope for more, however, were absurd;
Renunciation is our plan, 'tis plain.

And then the myth. What can we do with that?
What was a living treasure-house to him,
A tree of life, emotion's fountain-head,
To us are names, all colorless and flat.
Ho! tireless searchers, resolute and grim,
The thing is dead. Seek not to wake the dead.

It will be observed that Geibel has put in the front line the things that remain of Pindar, the 'Tiefsinn seiner Gedanken.' Against the low estimate in which certain Pindarists have held the thought of the great Theban, I have protested more than once and venture to add another protest in the fashion I have affected so much of late:

Pindar is charged with poverty of thought:
A slender wit, in royal mantle clad,
He only gave what he from others had,
He only taught what he himself was taught.

But we, who deemed his odes with wisdom fraught,
Heed not his critics' small, fault-finding fad—
We, who in every time, or good or bad,
Counsel and comfort from the singer sought,

¹ "Nimmer gelingt's dir, Freund, uns Pindars Lied zu beleben,
Wie's in Olympias Hain einst die Hellenen ergriff.
Zwar wir erbau'n uns noch heut an dem Tiefsinn seiner Gedanken,
Spüren des Fittichs Schwung, der den Begeisterten trug,
Ahnen die Rhythmengewalt der sich kühn auftürmenden Worte,
Aber der reine Genuss bleibt uns auf ewig versagt.
Was ein lebendiger Schatz ihm war und ein Born der Empfindung,
Ward zum dunklen Geweb frostiger Namen für uns;
Pfückt' er doch seinen Gesang vom blühenden Baume des Mythus,
Und kein forschender Fleiss weckt den erstorbenen auf."

Emmanuel Geibel, 'Distichen aus dem Wintertagebüche' (1877). Cf. N. J. B. 19, 195.

And not in vain. But when the counsel came,
Such was its music that we half forgot
Its sterling value for its silvery ring—

The cherub wisdom for the seraph flame.
Comfort descended, but they noted not
The healing for the plumage of its wing.

In his Life of Apollonius of Tyana, Philostratus¹ tells a story about the travels of that worthy, which many years ago, I dressed up after my fashion at that time, Essays and Studies, page 261.

Scene: Zeugma, a city of Mesopotamia.

Dramatis personae: Apollonius; custom-house officer.

C. H. O. Well, sir. Sharp's the word. What have you got to declare? What are you importing?

Apollonius. Let me see. (Counts on his fingers.) There's Grace, there's Temperance, there's Faith, there's Hope, there's Charity, there's—

C. H. O. (Writes.) Be quick about it. Are those all your slaves?

Apollonius. Slaves, indeed! They are my virtues.

The motif was not original with philosophers. It occurs in Greek comic poetry once, if not more than once, and as Philostratus dealt with reminiscence, I will match reminiscence with reminiscence. My memory goes back to a very early period of my life, and what I am about to record may seem trivial, but I have an invincible propensity to correlate fiction with fact, literature with life. If I have not booked my own life, I have at all events lived my books. A large vacant, sunny lot, adjoining my grandfather's house in Charleston, was the favourite resort of negro washer-women who exercised a vocation which has been consecrated by the greatest poetical genius. Indeed, one of my earliest essays, entitled Nausikaa, dealt with the washer-women of lay and legend. An urchin of some eight or ten years, I stood by, watching and listening. The race is fond of talking about religious matters and I expected to hear something about their experiences. One of them said to the other, "I had faith, and I had hope, and I had charity, and I had patience, and I had temperance." Having been early indoctrinated into an abhorrence of self-righteousness, I was disgusted at this display of what I supposed to be claims to a high seat in the Kingdom, but then after a pause she said, "And last of all I had Sukey Ann," thus reversing the situation at Zeugma.

B. L. GILDERSLEEVE.

¹ Bk. i, chap. 20 (Conybeare's text):

ταριθντας δὲ αὐτὸς ἐσ τὴν μέσην τῶν ποταμῶν ὁ τελώνης ὁ ἐπιβεβλημένος τῷ Ζεύματι τρὸς τὸ πινάκιον ἦγε καὶ ἡρώτα, δὲ τι ἀπάγουεν, δὲ δὲ Ἀπολλώνιος "ἀπάγω" ἔφη "σωφροσύνην δικαιοσύνην δρετὴν ἐγκράτειαν ἀνδρειαν δισκοῖν." πολλὰ καὶ οὗτω θήλεα εἶραν δύματα, δὲ δὲ ἥδη βλέπων τὸ ἑαυτοῦ κέρδος "ἀπέγραψαι οὖν" ἔφη "τὰς δοῦλας." δὲ δὲ "οὐκ ἔξεστιν," εἶπεν, "οὐ γάρ δούλας ἀπάγω ταῦτας, ἀλλὰ δεσποινας."

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Allen (James Turney). *The Greek Theater of the Fifth Century Before Christ.* (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 7.) Berkeley, *University of California*, 1919.

Aristotle, *The Works of.* Translated into English. *Oeconomica*, by E. S. Forster. *Atheniensium Respublica*, by Sir Frederic G. Kenyon. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1920.

Ausonius. With an English translation by Hugh G. Evelyn White. In two volumes. Vol. I. (*Loeb Classical Library.*) London, *William Heinemann*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1919. \$2.25.

Corpus scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum. Aug. Taurinorum, etc., *In aedibus Io. Bapt. Paraviae et Sociorum*, 1920:

No. 25. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos libri X, XI, XII.* Recensuit, praefatus est, appendicem criticam et indicem addidit Rem. Sabbadini. L. 3.

No. 26. *A. Persii Flacci Satirarum liber.* Recensuit, praefatus est, appendice critica instruxit Felix Ramorinus. L. 4,50.

No. 27. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Laelius de amicitia liber.* Recensuit, praefatus est, appendice critica instruxit Egnatius Bassi. L. 5.

Euclid in Greek. Book I with introduction and notes by Sir Thomas L. Heath. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1920. 10sh. net.

Fay (Percival B.) *The Use of Tu and Vous in Molière.* (University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 227-286. March 23, 1920.) Berkeley, *University of California Press*.

Fiske (George Converse). *Lucilius and Horace.* (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, Number 7.) Madison, 1920. 525 pp. with index. \$2.50.

Fontes historiae religionis ex auctoribus Graecis et Latinis collectos subsidiis societatis Rhenanae promovendis litteris edidit Carolus Clemens. Fasciculus I: Fontes historiae religionis Persicae collegit Carolus Clemens. Bonnae, in aedibus A. Marci et E. Weberi, 1920.

Fronto, Marcus Cornelius, *The Correspondence of.* Edited and translated into English by C. R. Haines. In two volumes. Vol. I. (*Loeb Classical Library.*) London, *William Heinemann*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1919. \$2.25.

Journal of the American Oriental Society. Vol. 40, Part I, February 1920. New Haven, Connecticut, *Yale University Press*.

Kurrelmeyer (W.) Kartalne, Kartauwe. *The Modern Language Association of America*, 1920. (Reprinted from the Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, XXVIII, 1.)

Longfellow (H. W.) *Il poema dei pellirosse (The Song of Hiawatha).* Prima traduzione italiana nel metro dell' originale. Per cura di Elena Beccarini Crescenzi. (Biblioteca dei popoli diretta da Paolo Emilio Pavolini. XIII.) Milano, Palermo, Napoli, Genova, Bologna, Torino, Remo Sandron, 1920. Lire 5.

Martial. *Epigrams.* With an English translation by Walter C. A. Ker. In two volumes. (*Loeb Classical Library.*) Vol. I. London, *William Heinemann*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1919. \$2.25.

Modern Language Notes. Vol. XXXV, Numbers 4, 5, 6. April, May, June, 1920. Baltimore, *The Johns Hopkins Press*.

Neuphilologische Mitteilungen. XX. Jahrg. 1919, Nr. 6-8. Helsingfors, *Handelstryckeriet*.

Oxford English Dictionary. Edited by Sir James A. H. Murray, Henry Bradley, W. A. Craigie and C. T. Onions. Vol. X. TI-Z. VISOR-VYWER. By W. A. Craigie. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, March, 1920.

Palamas (Kostes). Life Immovable. Translated by Aristides E. Phoutrides. With Introduction and Notes. Cambridge, *Harvard University Press*, 1919. 237 pp. \$2.

Pallis (Alex.). To the Romans. A Commentary. 190 pp. Liverpool, *The Liverpool Booksellers' Co., Ltd.*, 1920.

Pasquali (Giorgio). Orazio lirico. Firenze, *Felice le Monnier*, 1920.

Phaedri Fabulae Aesopiae. Cum Nicolai Perotti prologo et decem novis fabulis. Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit Johannes Percival Postgate. (Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis.) Oxonii, *E Typographeo Clarendoniano*, 1920.

Phillimore (J. S.). Ille Ego: Vergil and Professor Richmond. 24 pp. London etc., *Oxford University Press*, 1920.

Rostagni (A.). Ibis: Storia di un poemetto greco. (Contributi alla scienza dell' antichità pubblicati da G. de Sanctis e L. Pareti. Vol. III.) Firenze, *Felice Le Monnier*, 1920. L. 12.

Rudwin (Maximilian J.). The Origin of the German Carnival Comedy. New York, *G. E. Stechert & Co.*, 1920. \$1.25 paper; \$1.75 cloth.

Schofield (William Henry). Mythical Bards and The Life of William Wallace. (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature. Vol. V.) Cambridge, *Harvard University Press*, 1920.

Smith (Kirby Flower). Martial, The Epigrammatist, and other Essays. Baltimore, *The Johns Hopkins Press*, 1920. \$2.

Sophocles. The Oedipus Tyrannus. Translated and Explained by J. T. Sheppard. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1920. 20sh.

Studer (Paul). The Study of Anglo-Norman. Inaugural Lecture. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1920.

Studies in Philology. Vol. XVII, Nos. 1 and 2. January, April 1920. Chapel Hill, *The University of North Carolina*.

Σύλλογος πρὸς διάδοσιν ὀφελίμων βιβλίων, 28. Αἱ ἀξιώσεις τῆς ἐργασίας καὶ τοῦ κεφαλαιοῦ. Τπὸ W. R. Cooper. Μετάφρασις Κωνσταντίνου Α. Δοσίου. Ἐν Ἀθήναις, Βιβλοπωλεῖον Ἰωάννου N. Σιδέρη, 1919.

Watt (Lauchlan Maclean). Douglas's Aeneid. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1920. 14sh.